arXiv:0903.5537v1 [math.NT] 31 Mar 2009

Differentiability of the Minkowski question mark function.

Anna A. Dushistova, Igor D. Kan, Nikolai G. Moshchevitin [1]

Abstract

We prove new results on the derivative of the Minkowski question mark function. Some of our theorems are non-improvable.

1. The Minkowski function $?(x)$. The function $?(x)$ is defined as follows. $?(0) = 0, ?(1) = 1$, if the values $?\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)$ and $?\left(\frac{p'}{q'}\right)$ are defined for consecutive Farey fractions $\frac{p}{q}, \frac{p'}{q'}$ then

$$?\left(\frac{p+p'}{q+q'}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(?\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + ?\left(\frac{p'}{q'}\right)\right);$$

for irrational $x \in [0,1]$ function $?(x)$ is defined by continuous arguments. This function firstly was considered by H. Minkowski (see. [1], p.p. 50-51) in 1904. $?(x)$ is a continuous increasing function. It has derivative almost everywhere. It satisfies Lipschitz condition [2], [3]. It is a well-known fact that the derivative $?'(x)$ can take only two values - 0 or $+\infty$. Almost everywhere we have $?'(x) = 0$. Also if irrational $x = [0; a_1, ..., a_t, ...]$ is represented as a regular continued fraction with natural partial quotients then

$$?(x) = \frac{1}{2^{a_1-1}} - \frac{1}{2^{a_1+a_2-1}} + ... + \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_n-1}} + ...$$

These and some other results one can find for example in papers [2],[4],[5]. Here we should note the connection between function $?(x)$ and Stern-Brocot sequences. We remind the reader the definition of Stern-Brocot sequences F_n, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. First of all let us put $F_0 = \{0, 1\} = \{\frac{0}{1}, \frac{1}{1}\}$. Then for the sequence F_n treated as increasing sequence of rationals $0 = x_{0,n} < x_{1,n} < \cdots < x_{N(n),n} = 1, N(n) = 2^n$, $x_{j,n} = p_{j,n}/q_{j,n}, (p_{j,n}, q_{j,n}) = 1$ we define the next sequence F_{n+1} as $F_{n+1} = F_n \cup Q_{n+1}$ where Q_{n+1} is the set of the form $Q_{n+1} = \{x_{j-1,n} \oplus x_{j,n}, j = 1, \ldots, N(n)\}$. Here operation $\oplus$ means taking the mediant fraction for two rational fractions: $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{a+c}{b+d}$. The Minkowski question mark function $?(x)$ is the limit distribution function for Stern-Brocot sequences:

$$?(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\#\{\xi \in F_n : \ \xi \leqslant x\}}{2^n + 1}.$$

2. Notation and parameters. For natural numbers $a_1, ..., a_t$ the notation $\langle a_1, ..., a_t\rangle$ denotes the continuant with digits $a_1, ..., a_t$. That is empty continuant is equal to one,

$$\langle a_1\rangle = a_1, \ \langle a_1, ..., a_t\rangle = a_t \cdot \langle a_1, ..., a_{t-1}\rangle + \langle a_1, ..., a_{t-2}\rangle, \ t \geqslant 2.$$

For irrational $x \in (0, 1)$ we consider the continued fraction expansion

$$x = [0; a_1, a_2, ..., a_t, ...] = \cfrac{1}{a_1 + \cfrac{1}{a_2 + \cdots + \cfrac{1}{a_t + \ldots}}}$$

with natural partial quotients a_t. For breavity we use the notation

$$x = [a_1, ..., a_t, ...].$$

---

[1] Research is supported by RFBR grant No. 09-01-00371-a

For the continued fraction under consideration the convergent fraction of order t is denoted as $p_t/q_t = p_t(x)/q_t(x) = [a_1, a_2, ..., a_t]$ (hence, $q_t = q_t(x) = \langle a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle, p_t = p_t(x) = \langle a_2, ..., a_t\rangle$). For an irrational number x we consider the sum $S_x(t)$ of its partial quotients up to t-th:

$$S_x(t) = a_1 + a_2 + ... + a_t.$$

We need numbers

$$\lambda_j = \frac{j+\sqrt{j^2+4}}{2}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, ..., \tag{1}$$

$$\mu_j = \frac{j+2+\sqrt{j^2+4j}}{2}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, ..., \tag{2}$$

$$\kappa_1 = \frac{2\log\lambda_1}{\log 2} = \frac{2\log\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}}{\log 2} = 1.388^+, \tag{3}$$

$$\kappa_2 = \frac{4\log\lambda_5 - 5\log\lambda_4}{\log\lambda_5 - \log\lambda_4 - \log\sqrt{2}} = \frac{4\log\frac{5+\sqrt{29}}{2} - 5\log(2+\sqrt{5})}{\log\frac{5+\sqrt{29}}{2} - \log(2+\sqrt{5}) - \log\sqrt{2}} = 4.401^+. \tag{4}$$

Also for $n \geqslant 5$ we need the number

$$\kappa_n = \frac{(n+1)\log\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - \log\frac{n+2+\sqrt{n^2+4n}}{2}}{(n-1)\log\sqrt{2} - \log\frac{n+2+\sqrt{n^2+4n}}{2} + 2\log\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}} =$$

$$= \frac{(n+1)\log\lambda_1 - \log\mu_n}{(n-1)\log\sqrt{2} - \log\mu_n + 2\log\lambda_1} = \kappa_1 + \frac{4\log\lambda_1 - 2\log 2}{(\log 2)^2}\cdot\frac{\log n}{n} + O\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^2\right), \quad n \to \infty. \tag{5}$$

3. A result by J. Paradis, P. Viader, L. Bibiloni. In [5] the following statement is proved.

Theorem A.

1. Let for real irrational $x \in (0,1)$ with κ_1 from (3) one has

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} < \kappa_1.$$

Then if $?'(x)$ exists the equality $?'(x) = +\infty$ holds.

2. Let $\kappa_3 = 5.319^+$ be the root of equation $2\log(1+z) = z\log 2$. Let for real irrational $x \in (0,1)$ one has

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} \geqslant \kappa_3.$$

Then if $?'(x)$ exists the equality $?'(x) = 0$ holds.

4. Our main results. In this paper we prove the following theorems. In Theorems 1 – 4 below κ_1 is taken from (3) and κ_2 is taken from (4)

Theorem 1.

(i) Let for an irrational number x there exists a constant C such that for all natural t one has

$$S_x(t) \leqslant \kappa_1 t + \frac{\log t}{\log 2} + C. \tag{6}$$

Then $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x) = +\infty$.

(ii) Let $\psi(t)$ be an increasing function such that $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\psi(t)=+\infty$. Then there exists an irrational number $x\in(0,1)$ such that $?'(x)$ does not exist and for any t one has

$$S_x(t)\leqslant\kappa_1 t+\frac{\log t}{\log 2}+\psi(t). \tag{7}$$

Theorem 2.

(i) Let for an irrational number $x\in(0,1)$ the derivative $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x)=0$. Then for any real function $\psi=\psi(t)$ under conditions

$$\psi(t)\geqslant 0,\quad \psi(t)=o\left(\frac{\log\log t}{\log t}\right),\ t\to\infty$$

there exists T depending on ψ such that for all $t\geqslant T$ one has

$$\max_{u\leqslant t}\left(S_x(u)-\kappa_1 u\right)\geqslant\frac{\sqrt{2\log\lambda_1-\log 2}}{\log 2}\cdot\sqrt{t\log t}\cdot(1-t^{-\psi(t)}).$$

(ii) There exists an irrational $x\in(0,1)$ such that $?'(x)=0$ and for all t large enough one has

$$S_x(t)-\kappa_1 t\leqslant\frac{\sqrt{16\log\lambda_1-8\log 2}}{\log 2}\cdot\sqrt{t\log t}\cdot\left(1+2^5\left(\frac{\log\log t}{\log t}\right)\right).$$

Theorem 3.

(i) Let for an irrational number x there exists a constant C such that for all natural t one has

$$S_x(t)\geqslant\kappa_2 t-C. \tag{8}$$

Then $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x)=0$.

(ii) Let $\psi(t)$ be an increasing function such that $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\psi(t)=+\infty$. Then there exists an irrational number $x\in(0,1)$ such that $?'(x)$ does not exist and and for any t one has

$$S_x(t)\geqslant\kappa_2 t-\psi(t). \tag{9}$$

Theorem 4.

(i) Let for an irrational number $x\in(0,1)$ the derivative $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x)=+\infty$. Then for any t large enough one has

$$\max_{u\leqslant t}\left(\kappa_2 u-S_x(u)\right)\geqslant\frac{\sqrt{t}}{10^8}. \tag{10}$$

(ii) There exists an irrational $x\in(0,1)$ such that $?'(x)=+\infty$ and for t large enough one has

$$\kappa_2 t-S_x(t)\leqslant 200\sqrt{t}.$$

From Theorems 1 – 4 we immediately deduce the following result which is stronger than the result announced by the first and the third authors in the preprint [6]. We should note that the statements of the next Corollary (and hence Theorems 1 – 4) improves Theorem A by J. Paradis, P. Viader and L. Bibiloni cited in Section 3.

Corollary 1.

1. Let for real irrational $x \in (0,1)$ one has

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} < \kappa_1.$$

Then $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x) = +\infty$.

2. There exists an irrational x such that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} = \kappa_1$$

and $?'(x) = 0$.

3. Let for real irrational $x \in (0,1)$ one has

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} > \kappa_2.$$

Then $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x) = 0$.

4. There exists an irrational x such that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} = \kappa_2$$

and $?'(x) = +\infty$.

Remark. It is possible to prove that for any λ from the interval

$$\kappa_1 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant \kappa_2$$

there exist irrationals $x, y, z \in [0,1]$ such that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_y(t)}{t} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_z(t)}{t} = \lambda$$

and $?'(x) = 0, ?'(y) = +\infty$ but $?'(z)$ does not exist.

5. Results on numbers with bounded partial quotients. By $E_n, n \geqslant 2$ we denote the set of irrational numbers x from the interval $(0,1)$ such that in the continued fraction expansion $x = [a_1, a_2, ..., a_t, ...]$ all partial quotients a_j are bounded by n:

$$a_j \leqslant n, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, 3, ...$$

In this paper we prove the following three theorems about the values of the derivative of the function $?(x)$ when $x \in E_n$. In theorems 5,6 below κ_n is taken from ().

Theorem 5.

(i) Let $n \geqslant 5$ and $x \in E_n$. Let for some constant C and for any natural t one has

$$S_x(t) \leqslant \kappa_n t + C. \tag{11}$$

Then $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x) = +\infty$.

(ii) Let $\psi(t)$ be an increasing function such that $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \psi(t) = +\infty$. Then for a given $n \geqslant 5$ there exists an irrational number $x \in E_n$ such that $?'(x)$ does not exist and for any natural t one has

$$S_x(t) \leqslant \kappa_n t + \psi(t). \tag{12}$$

Theorem 6.

(i) Let for $x \in E_n, n \geqslant 5$ the derivative $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x) = 0$. Then for t large enough one has

$$\max_{u \leqslant t} (S_x(u) - \kappa_n u) \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{t}}{160(n+2)^{10}}.$$

(ii) For a given $n \geqslant 5$ there exists $x \in E_n$ such that $?'(x) = 0$ and for t large enough one has

$$S_x(t) - \kappa_n t \leqslant 15n\sqrt{t}.$$

Theorem 7. *Let $x \in E_4$. Then $?'(x)$ exists and $?'(x) = +\infty$.*

6. Lemma about the derivative of the function $?(x)$. First of all we should note that the set F_n consists of all fractions $\frac{p}{q} \in [0,1]$ such that in the continued fraction expansion $\frac{p}{q} = [a_1, ..., a_t]$ one has $a_1 + ... + a_t \leqslant n$. As for the set $Q_n = F_n \setminus F_{n-1}$ it consists of all fractions $\frac{p}{q} \in [0,1]$ satisfying the condition $a_1 + ... + a_t = n$.

For a real $x = [a_1, ..., a_r, ...]$ we consider two convergents $\frac{p_{r-1}}{q_{r-1}} = [a_1, ..., a_{r-1}]$ and $\frac{p_r}{q_r} = [a_1, ..., a_r]$. As $\left|\frac{p_{r-1}}{q_{r-1}} - \frac{p_r}{q_r}\right| = \frac{1}{q_r q_{r-1}}$ and fractions are consecutive elements from F_n (where $n = a_1 + ... + a_r$) we see that

$$\frac{\left|?\left(\frac{p_{r-1}}{q_{r-1}}\right) - ?\left(\frac{p_r}{q_r}\right)\right|}{\left|\frac{p_{r-1}}{q_{r-1}} - \frac{p_r}{q_r}\right|} = \frac{q_r q_{r-1}}{2^{a_1 + ... + a_r}}. \tag{13}$$

In this section we generalize the equality (13).

We must do another useful observation. Let ξ^0, ξ^1 be two consecutive elements of F_n and $x = [a_1, ..., a_t, ...] \in (\xi^0, \xi^1)$. Consider the fraction $\xi = \xi^0 \oplus \xi^1 \in F_{n+1}$ (notation $\oplus$ is defined in Section 1) and suppose $x \neq \xi$. In this situation one of the two fractions ξ^0, ξ^1 lie on the same side from x with ξ. Then the fraction on the opposite side must be a convergent fraction to x.

Lemma 1. *For an irrational $x = [a_1, ..., a_t, ...] \in (0,1)$ and δ small enough there exists a natural $r = r(x, \delta)$ such that*

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{q_r q_{r-1}}{2^{a_1 + ... + a_r + 4}} \tag{14}$$

Proof. It is enough to prove Lemma 1 for positive δ. Define the unique natural number n such that $F_n \cap (x, x+\delta) = \emptyset$, $F_{n+1} \cap (x, x+\delta) = \xi$. So $(x, x+\delta) \subset (\xi^0, \xi^1)$, where $\xi^0 = \frac{p^0}{q^0}, \xi^1 = \frac{p^1}{q^1}$ are two successive points from the finite set F_n. Then $\xi = \xi^0 \oplus \xi^1 = \frac{p^0 + p^1}{q^0 + q^1}$. We see that ξ and ξ^1 both lie on the same side from x. Then as it was mentioned above one can easily see from the Farey tree construction that for some natural t will happen $\xi^0 = p_t(x)/q_t(x) = p_t/q_t$. At the same time rationals ξ and ξ^1 must be among convergent fractions to x or intermediate fractions to x (intermediate fraction is a fraction of the form $\frac{p_t a + p_{t-1}}{q_t a + q_{t-1}}, 1 \leqslant a < a_{t+1}$).

Define natural z to be minimal such that either $\xi_- = \xi^0 \underbrace{\oplus \xi \oplus ... \oplus \xi}_{z} \in (x, \xi)$ or $\xi_+ = \xi^1 \underbrace{\oplus \xi \oplus ... \oplus \xi}_{z} \in (\xi, x+\delta)$. Then $\xi_{--} = \xi^0 \underbrace{\oplus \xi \oplus ... \oplus \xi}_{z-1} \leqslant x$ and $\xi_{++} = \xi^1 \underbrace{\oplus \xi \oplus ... \oplus \xi}_{z-1} \geqslant x + \delta$. As points $\xi_{--} < \xi_- < \xi < \xi_+ < \xi_{++}$ are successive points from F_{n+z+1} and $?(x)$ increases, we have

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+z+1}} \leqslant \min\{?(\xi_+) - ?(\xi), ?(\xi) - ?(\xi_-)\} \leqslant ?(x+\delta) - ?(x). \tag{15}$$

As δ is small we can suppose that $n > 1$. So $q^0 \neq q^1$. Then there may be two opportunities: $q^0 > q^1$ (**case 1**) and $q^0 < q^1$ (**case 2**).

Case 1. In this case we have $q_t = q^0 > q^1$. We see that $\xi^0 = \frac{p_t}{q_t} \in F_n \setminus F_{n-1}$ but $\xi^1 \in F_{n-1}$. So $n = a_1 + ... + a_t$. Then for some fraction $\frac{p'}{q'} \in F_{n-1}$ we have $\frac{p'}{q'} \oplus \frac{p^1}{q^1} = \frac{p^0}{q^0}$ and $\frac{p'}{q'}, \frac{p^0}{q^0}$ lie on the same side from x. So (as it was mentioned above in the beginning of Section 6) from the Farey tree construction we see that $\xi^1 = \frac{p_{t-1}}{q_{t-1}}$ is also a convergent fraction to x. So

$$\delta < \frac{1}{q_t q_{t-1}}. \tag{16}$$

We should consider two subcases: $a_{t+1} = 1$ (**case 1.1**) and $a_{t+1} > 1$ (**case 1.2**).

Case 1.1. Here we have $a_{t+1} = 1$. So $\xi = \frac{p_t+p_{t-1}}{q_t+q_{t-1}} = \frac{p_{t+1}}{q_{t+1}}$. Now we must look for the natural number z defined above. It may happen that $z = 1$ (**case 1.1.1**) or $z > 1$ (**case 1.1.2**).

Case 1.1.1. Here from (15) we see that $?(x+\delta) - ?(x) \geqslant \frac{1}{2^{n+2}}$ and together with (16) this leads to the inequality

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{q_t q_{t-1}}{2^{n+2}} = \frac{q_t q_{t-1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+2}}. \tag{17}$$

Case 1.1.2. Now $z > 1$. From the Farey tree constructing process we see that $z \leqslant a_{t+2}$. As $(x, x+\delta) \subset (\xi_{--}, \xi_{++})$ we see that

$$\delta \leqslant (\xi_{++} - \xi) + (\xi - \xi_{--}) = \frac{1}{q_t + q_{t-1}} \left(\frac{1}{(z-1)(q_t+q_{t-1}) + q_{t-1}} + \frac{1}{(z-1)(q_t+q_{t-1}) + q_t} \right) \leqslant \frac{2}{(z-1)q_{t+1}^2}.$$

Here we use the fact that fractions ξ_{--}, ξ, ξ_{++} are successive elements from F_{n+z} and

$$|\xi_{++} - \xi| = \frac{1}{(q_t+q_{t-1})((z-1)(q_t+q_{t-1}) + q_{t-1})}, |\xi_{--} - \xi| = \frac{1}{(q_t+q_{t-1})((z-1)(q_t+q_{t-1}) + q_t)}.$$

We apply (15) to get

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{(z-1)q_{t+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+z+2}} \geqslant \frac{z q_{t+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}+z+3}}.$$

As $2 \leqslant z \leqslant a_{t+2}$, $a_{t+2}q_{t+1} \geqslant q_{t+2}/2$ and the function $\frac{z}{2^z}$ decreases we see that in the case 1.1.2 the following inequality is valid:

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{q_{t+2} q_{t+1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}+a_{t+2}+4}}. \tag{18}$$

Case 1.2. We have $a_{t+1} \geqslant 2$ so $z = 1$ and $\xi_- = \frac{2p_t+p_{t-1}}{2q_t+q_{t-1}} \in (x, \xi)$. Now from (16) and (15) we deduce that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{q_t q_{t-1}}{2^{n+2}} = \frac{q_t q_{t-1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+2}}. \tag{19}$$

Case 2. In this case we have $q_t = q^0 < q^1$. We see that $\xi^1 \in F_n \setminus F_{n-1}$ and $\xi^0 = \frac{p_t}{q_t} \in F_{n-1}$. So in the case 2 we see that $n = a_1 + ... + a_t + l$ with some $l < a_{t+1}$. We can establish the inequality

$$\delta < \frac{1}{q_t q^1}. \tag{20}$$

Consider the convergent $\frac{p_{t-1}}{q_{t-1}}$. The fraction ξ^1 is an intermediate fraction to x. It lies between ξ and $\xi' = \frac{p_{t-1}}{q_{t-1}}$. Define l from the condition $\xi^1 = \xi' \underbrace{\oplus \xi^0 \oplus ... \oplus \xi^0}_{l}$. So $q^1 = q_{t-1} + l q_t$. Moreover we see that $a_{t+1} \geqslant l + 1 \geqslant 2$. It may happen that $\frac{p_{t+1}}{q_{t+1}} = \frac{p_t+p^1}{q_t+q^1} = \xi$ (**case 2.1**) or $\frac{p_{t+1}}{q_{t+1}} \neq \xi$ (**case 2.2**).

Case 2.1 Let $\frac{p_{t+1}}{q_{t+1}} = \xi$. Then $n = a_1 + ... + a_t + a_{t+1} - 1$ and $l = a_{t+1} - 1$. It may happen that $z = 1$ (**case 2.1.1**) or $z > 1$ (**case 2.1.2**).

Case 2.1.1. Note that $q^1 + q_t = q_{t+1} = a_{t+1}q_t + q_{t-1}$ and so $q^1 = q_{t+1} - q_t \geqslant (a_{t+1} - 1)q_t + q_{t-1} \geqslant q_{t+1}/2$ as $a_{t+1} \geqslant 2$. From (20) and (15) we see that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{q_t q^1}{2^{n+2}} \geqslant \frac{q_t q_{t+1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+l+3}} \geqslant \frac{q_t q_{t+1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+a_{t+1}+2}}. \tag{21}$$

Case 2.1.2. Here we have $2 \leqslant z \leqslant a_{t+2} + 1$. As in the case 1.1.2 we have

$$\delta \leqslant (\xi_{++} - \xi) + (\xi - \xi_{--}) = \frac{1}{q_{t+1}} \left(\frac{1}{(z-1)q_{t+1} + q_t} + \frac{1}{(z-1)q_{t+1} + q^1} \right) \leqslant \frac{2}{(z-1)q_{t+1}^2} \leqslant \frac{4}{zq_{t+1}^2}.$$

From this inequality and (20) we see that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{zq_{t+1}^2}{2^{n+z+3}} \geqslant \frac{(a_{t+2}+1)q_{t+1}^2}{2^{n+a_{t+2}+3}} \geqslant \frac{(a_{t+2}+1)q_{t+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}+a_{t+2}+2}} \geqslant \frac{q_{t+2}q_{t+1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}+a_{t+2}+2}}.. \tag{22}$$

Case 2.2. We have $\frac{p_{t+1}}{q_{t+1}} \neq \frac{p_t + p^1}{q_t + q^1}$. So in this case $\frac{2p_t + p^1}{2q_t + q^1} = \xi_- \in (x, \xi)$ and $z = 1$. We see from (20) and (15) that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{q_t q^1}{2^{n+2}}.$$

As $\frac{p^1}{q^1} = \frac{lp_t + p_{t-1}}{lq_t + q_{t-1}}$ and $n = a_1 + .. + a_t + l$ we see that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \geqslant \frac{lq_t^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+l+2}} \geqslant \frac{q_{t+1}q_t}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+a_{t+1}+3}}. \tag{23}$$

Now we pick together the results of the cases 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2 (that is the inequalities (17,18,19,21,22,23)) to get the statement of the lemma. Lemma 1 is proved.

Lemma 2. *For an irrational $x \in (0,1)$ and for δ small enough there exists a natural $r = r(x, \delta)$ and such that*

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \leqslant \frac{q_{r+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_{r+1}-2}} \tag{24}$$

Proof. It is enough to prove Lemma 1 for positive δ. We use the notation $\xi^0, = \frac{p_t}{q_t}, \xi^1 = \frac{p^1}{q^1}, \xi, \xi_-, \xi_+, \xi_{--}, \xi_{++}$ and z from the proof of Lemma 1. As points $\xi_{--} < \xi_- < \xi < \xi_+ < \xi_{++}$ are successive points from F_{n+z+1} and $?(x)$ increases, we have

$$?(x+\delta) - ?(x) \leqslant ?(\xi_{++}) - ?(\xi_{--}) = \frac{4}{2^{n+z+1}}. \tag{25}$$

Consider two cases: $\xi_- \in (x, \xi)$ (**case 1**) and $\xi_- \notin (x, \xi)$ but then $\xi_+ \in (\xi, x + \delta)$ (**csae 2**).

Case 1. Here we have $\delta > \xi - \xi_-$. It may happen that $z + 1$ (**case 1.1**) or $z > 1$ (**case 1.2**).

Case 1.1. Let $z = 1$. Then $\xi_- = p/q, q = z_* q_t + q_{t-1} \leqslant q_{t+1}, 1 \leqslant z_* \leqslant a_{t+1}, \xi = (p - p_t)/(q - q_t)$, $n + 2 = a_1 + ... + a_t + z_*$ and

$$\delta > \xi - \xi_- \geqslant \frac{1}{(q - q_t)q} \geqslant \frac{1}{(z_* + 1)^2 q_t^2}.$$

We take into account (25) to see that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta) - ?(x)}{\delta} \leqslant \frac{(z_*+1)^2 q_t^2}{2^{n+2}} = \frac{(z_*+1)^2 q_t^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_t+z_*}} \leqslant \frac{q_t^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_t-2}}. \tag{26}$$

Case 1.2. If $z > 1$ then $\xi = p_{t+1}/q_{t+1}$, $\xi_{--} = p_{t+2}/q_{t+2}$, $z = a_{t+2}+1$, $n+1 = a_1+...+a_{t+1}$ and

$$\delta > \xi - \xi_- \geqslant \frac{1}{(zq_{t+1}+q_t)q_{t+1}} \geqslant \frac{1}{(z+1)q_{t+1}^2}.$$

From (25) we see that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta){-}?(x)}{\delta} \leqslant \frac{(z+1)q_{t+1}^2}{2^{n+z-1}} = \frac{(z+1)q_{t+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}+z-2}} \leqslant \frac{q_{t+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}-2}}. \tag{27}$$

Case 2. Here we have $z \leqslant a_{t+2}, \xi = p_{t+1}/q_{t+1}, n+1 = a_1+...+a_{t+1}$. Now we deduce

$$\delta > \xi_+ - \xi \geqslant \frac{1}{(zq_{t+1}+q^1)q_{t+1}} \geqslant \frac{1}{(z+1)q_{t+1}^2}$$

(remind that $q^1 < q_{t+1}$ is the denominator of ξ^1). From (25) we see that

$$\frac{?(x+\delta){-}?(x)}{\delta} \leqslant \frac{(z+1)q_{t+1}^2}{2^{n+z-1}} = \frac{(z+1)q_{t+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}+z-2}} \leqslant \frac{q_{t+1}^2}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t+1}-2}}. \tag{28}$$

In any case (24) follows from (26),(27) or (28). Lemma 2 is proved.

7. More notation. In the sequel small letters a, b, c will be used for natural numbers. By capital letters $A, B, C, ...$ we denote finite sequences of natural numbers. For

$$A = a_1, a_2, ..., a_{t-1}, a_t$$

we use the notation

$$\overrightarrow{A} = a_1, a_2, ..., a_{t-1}, a_t, \quad \overleftarrow{A} = a_t, a_{t-1}, ..., a_2, a_1.$$

If a sequence $A = a_1, ..., a_t$ appears in a continuant expression or in a continued fraction expression it means that we should replace it by the consecutive block $a_1, ..., a_t$ of natural numbers a_j. For example for $A = a_1, ..., a_t$; $B = b_1, ..., b_i$; $X = x_1, ..., x_j$ and $Y = y_1, ..., y_k$ we have

$$\langle a, b, A, B, c, \overleftarrow{X}, \overrightarrow{Y}\rangle = \langle a, b, a_1, ..., a_t, b_1, ..., b_i, c, x_j, ..., x_1, y_1, ..., y_k\rangle$$

and

$$[a, b, A, B, c, \overleftarrow{X}, \overrightarrow{Y}] = [a, b, a_1, ..., a_t, b_1, ..., b_i, c, x_j, ..., x_1, y_1, ..., y_k].$$

For a sequence $A = a_1, a_2, ..., a_{t-1}, a_t$ we define

$$A_- = a_2, ..., a_{t-1}, a_t, \quad A^- = a_1, a_2, ..., a_{t-1}.$$

So

$$[\overrightarrow{A}] = \frac{\langle A_-\rangle}{\langle A\rangle}, \quad [\overleftarrow{A}] = \frac{\langle A^-\rangle}{\langle A\rangle}$$

and if $x = [a_1, a_2, ..., a_t, ...]$ then

$$\frac{p_t}{q_t} = \frac{p_t(x)}{q_t(x)} = \frac{\langle a_2, ..., a_t\rangle}{\langle a_1, ..., a_t\rangle}, \quad \frac{q_{t-1}}{q_t} = \frac{q_{t-1}(x)}{q_t(x)} = \frac{\langle a_1, ..., a_{t-1}\rangle}{\langle a_1, ..., a_t\rangle}.$$

Also in the case when A is an empty sequence we put $\langle A\rangle = 1$ and $\langle A_-\rangle = \langle A^-\rangle = [A] = 0$.

This notation is convenient to work with some identities involving continuants and continued fractions. We make use of the well known (see [7]) identity

$$\langle X, Y\rangle = \langle X\rangle \cdot \langle Y\rangle + \langle X^-\rangle \cdot \langle Y_-\rangle = \langle X\rangle \cdot \langle Y\rangle \cdot (1 + [\overleftarrow{X}] \cdot [\overrightarrow{Y}]). \tag{29}$$

8. Inequalities with continuants: unit variation.

Let sequences A, B, C be fixed. Consider a natural number $\tau \geqslant 2$. For $a \in \mathbb{N}, a \leqslant \tau - 1$ we put $b = \tau - a$. So

$$a + b = \tau.$$

We define function

$$F(a) = F_{A,B,C;\tau}(a) = \langle A, a, C, b, B\rangle = \langle A, a, C, \tau - a, B\rangle.$$

Lemma 3. *Let $a, b \neq 1$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be an upper bound for the maximal element among all the sequences A, B, C and integers a, b. Suppose $[\overleftarrow{A}] \neq 0, 1$.*

1. Let $a \neq b$. Then

$$F(a) \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right) F(a + \mathrm{sign}((a-b)).$$

2. Let $a = b$. Then

$$F(a) \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{16(n+2)^2}\right) \min\{F(a-1), F(a+1)\}.$$

3. Let $a = b$, $[\overrightarrow{C}] = [\overleftarrow{C}]$. Then

$$F(a) \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right) \max\{F(a-1), F(a+1)\}.$$

Corollary 2. *Let $a, b \neq 1$. Let n be an upper bound for the maximal element among all the sequences A, B, C and numbers a, b. Suppose $[\overleftarrow{A}] \neq 0, 1$. Then*

$$F(a) \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right) \min\{F(a-1), F(a+1)\}.$$

Definition 1. Let $a_i \pm 1 \geqslant 1, a_j \mp 1 \geqslant 1$. We define the procedure

$$a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t \quad \mapsto \quad a_1, ..., a_i \pm 1, ..., a_j \mp 1, ..., a_t, \ \ i < j$$

as a *unit variation* of the sequence $a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t$.

Remark. Let a sequence $a_1^*, ..., a_t^*$ is obtained by a unit variation from the sequence $a_1, ..., a_t$. Then for any $\gamma \leqslant t$ one has

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle a_1, ..., a_\gamma\rangle \leqslant \langle a_1^*, ..., a_\gamma^*\rangle \leqslant 2\langle a_1, ..., a_\gamma\rangle.$$

(This Remark follows from formula (29).)

Proof of Lemma 3. We apply (29) to see that $F(a)$ is a quadratic polynomial in a.

$$F(a) = \langle A, a\rangle\langle C\rangle\langle \tau - a, B\rangle + \langle A\rangle\langle C_-\rangle\langle \tau - a, B\rangle + \langle A, a\rangle\langle C^-\rangle\langle B\rangle + W, \tag{30}$$

where W does not depend on a. Note that

$$\langle A, a\rangle\langle C\rangle\langle \tau - a, B\rangle = \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle(a + [\overleftarrow{A}])(\tau - a + [\overrightarrow{B}]),$$

$$\langle A\rangle\langle C_-\rangle\langle \tau-a,B\rangle=\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle[\overrightarrow{C}](\tau-a+[\overrightarrow{B}]),$$
$$\langle A,a\rangle\langle C^-\rangle\langle B\rangle=\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle[\overleftarrow{C}](\ a+[\overleftarrow{A}]).$$

Put
$$\theta=[\overrightarrow{B}]-[\overleftarrow{A}]-[\overrightarrow{C}]+[\overleftarrow{C}].$$

Now (30) changes to
$$F(a)=\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle((\tau+\theta)a-a^2)+W_1, \tag{31}$$
where W_1 does not depend on a.

We want to obtain an upper bound for $|\theta|$. We see that $[\overrightarrow{B}],[\overleftarrow{A}],[\overrightarrow{C}],[\overleftarrow{C}]\in[0,1]$. Moreover n is an upper bound for the elements of the sequence A. So from the condition $[\overleftarrow{A}]\neq 0,1$ we have $\frac{1}{n+1}\leqslant[\overleftarrow{A}]\leqslant 1-\frac{1}{n+2}$.

Note that in the case $[\overrightarrow{C}]=[\overleftarrow{C}]$ we have

$$|\theta|\leqslant 1-\frac{1}{n+2}. \tag{32}$$

In the case $[\overrightarrow{C}]\neq[\overleftarrow{C}]$ we have the inequality

$$|\theta|\leqslant 2-\frac{1}{n+2}. \tag{33}$$

From (29) we see that

$$\langle A,a\pm1,C,b\mp1,B\rangle\leqslant 16\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle(a\pm1)(b\mp1)\leqslant 16(n+1)^2\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle \tag{34}$$

as $2\leqslant a,b\leqslant n$. Now

$$\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle\geqslant\frac{\langle A,a\pm1,C,b\mp1,B\rangle}{16(n+1)^2}=\frac{F(a\pm1)}{16(n+1)^2}. \tag{35}$$

From (31) with $\varepsilon\in\{-1,+1\}$ we have

$$F(a)=F(a+\varepsilon)+\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle(\varepsilon(a-b-\theta)+1). \tag{36}$$

Now we substitute (35) into the last inequality and obtain

$$F(a)\geqslant\left(1+\frac{\varepsilon(a-b-\theta)+1}{16(n+2)^2}\right)F(a+\varepsilon).$$

Let $a\neq b$ and $\varepsilon=\operatorname{sign}(a-b)$. Then by (33) we have

$$\varepsilon(a-b-\theta)+1=|a-b|+1\pm\theta\geqslant 2-|\theta|\geqslant\frac{1}{n+2}.$$

So we have
$$F(a)\geqslant\left(1+\frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right)F(a+\operatorname{sign}(a-b)) \tag{37}$$
and the first statement of Lemma 3 is proved.

Let $a=b$. Then
$$F(a)\geqslant\left(1+\frac{-\varepsilon\theta+1}{16(n+2)^2}\right)F(a+\varepsilon) \tag{38}$$

Now we choose ε to satisfy $-\varepsilon\theta \geqslant 0$ and obtain the second statement of Lemma 3.

Now we must consider the case when in addition to $a = b$ we suppose $[\overrightarrow{C}] = [\overleftarrow{C}]$. In this case from (38) and (32) it follows that

$$F(a) \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1-|\theta|}{16(n+2)^2}\right) F(a+\varepsilon) \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right) F(a+\varepsilon).$$

Lemma 3 is proved.

We need an improvement of Lemma 3 in the case $a \leqslant 4 < 5 \leqslant b$.

Lemma 4. *Let* $a \leqslant 4 < 5 \leqslant b = \tau - a,\ a+2 \leqslant b.$ *Then*

$$F(a+1) \geqslant \frac{385}{384} F(a).$$

Proof. We follow the arguments of the proof of Lemma 3. As $a \leqslant 4$ instead of the inequality (34) we see that

$$F(a) \leqslant 16\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle ab \leqslant 64b\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle.$$

So instead of (36,37)($\varepsilon = -1, \theta \geqslant -2$) we get

$$F(a+1) = F(a) + \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle(b-a+\theta+1) \geqslant F(a)\left(1 + \frac{b - \min(5, b-1)}{64b}\right) \geqslant \frac{385}{384} F(a)$$

as $b \geqslant 5$. Lemma is proved.

Define

$$U(t,s) = \{(a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) : \ a_j \in \mathbb{N}, a_1 + a_2 + ... + a_t = s\},$$

$$U_n(t,s) = \{(a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) : \ a_j \in \mathbb{N},\ a_j \leqslant n,\ a_1 + a_2 + ... + a_t = s\}.$$

Lemma 5.

1. The minimal value of the continuant

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle = \langle 2, a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle, \ \ (a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) \in U_n(t,s)$$

attains at the sequence $Q = a_1, a_2, ..., a_t$ *such that not more than one element* a_j *differs from* 1 *and from* n.

2. The maximal value of the continuant

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle = \langle 2, a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle, \ \ (a_1, a_2., .., a_t) \in U(t,s)$$

attains at the sequence $P = a_1, a_2, ..., a_t$ *such that for every* $i, j \in \{1, 2, ..., t\}$ *one has* $|a_i - a_j| \leqslant 1$.

Proof.

1. Suppose the minimum attains at a sequence with some elements $a_i, a_j \notin \{1, n\}, i < j$. We put $a = a_i, b = a_j, \tau = a + b$ and apply Corollary 2 to see that

$$\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t\rangle > \min\{\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i - 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_t\rangle, \langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_j - 1, ..., a_t\rangle\}$$

and this is a contradiction as

$$(a_1, ..., a_i - 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_t), (a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_j - 1, ..., a_t) \in U_n(t,s).$$

2. Assume that the conclusion is not true. Then we take one of the shortest subsequence $a_i, a_{i+1}, ..., a_j$ of P such that $|a_i - a_j| \geqslant 2$. Suppose $a_i > a_j$ without loss of generality. Put $a = a_i - 1, b = a_j + 1, \tau = a + b$.

If $a > b$ we have $a, b \geqslant 2$, $\mathrm{sign}(a-b) = +1$. So we apply statement 1 of Lemma 3 and obtain

$$\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i - 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_t\rangle > \langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t\rangle.$$

So $\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t\rangle$ is not maximal.

If $a = b$ we make use of the fact that the considered subsequence $a_i, a_{i+1}, ..., a_j$ is the shortest one. We have

$$a_{i+1} = a_{i+2} = ... = a_{j-1} = a_i - 1 = a_j + 1.$$

So for the sequence $C = a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}, ..., a_{j-1}$ we have $[\overrightarrow{C}] = [\overleftarrow{C}]$. Moreover $A = 2, a_1, ..., a_{i-1}$ is such that $[\overleftarrow{A}] \neq 0, 1$. Now we can apply statement 3 of Lemma 3 and it follows that

$$\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i - 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_t\rangle > \langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t\rangle.$$

We see again that $\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t\rangle$ is not maximal.

Lemma 5 is proved.

We need the following supplement to Lemma 5.

Lemma 6.

1. For any sequence $(a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) \in U_n(t, s)$ one has

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right)^{\frac{2\sigma_1 - n}{4}} \times \min_{(b_1, b_2, ..., b_t) \in U_n(t,s)} \langle 1, 1, b_1, b_2, ..., b_t\rangle, \tag{39}$$

where

$$\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \min(a_j - 1, n - a_j). \tag{40}$$

2. Let the maximal continuant with elements from the set $U(t, s)$ contains elements $a = 4, b = 5$. Then for any sequence $(a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) \in U(t, s)$ one has

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle \leqslant \left(\frac{385}{384}\right)^{-\frac{\sigma_2}{2}} \times \max_{(b_1, b_2, ..., b_t) \in U(t,s)} \langle 1, 1, b_1, b_2, ..., b_t\rangle, \tag{41}$$

where

$$\sigma_2 = \sigma_{2,t} = \sigma_2(a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \min(|a_j - 4|, |a_j - 5|) \tag{42}$$

Proof.

To prove Lemma 6 we observe that we can obtain the sequence with relatively minimal (maximal) continuant from any given sequence $(a_1, a_2, ..., a_t) \in U_n(t, s)$ (or $\in U(t, s)$) by successive applications of the unit variation procedure (see Definition 1). Here we must use only those unit variations for which the value of the continuant decreases (increases). From the proof of Lemma 1 we see that it is possible to do indeed.

Now we prove the statement 1. Note that for $1 < z < n$ the following inequality is valid:

$$|\min(z - 1, n - z) - \min(z - 2, n - z + 1)| \leqslant 1.$$

When a pair of elements a_i, a_j is replaced by the pair $a_i - 1, a_j + 1$ we have

$$|\sigma_1(a_1, ..., a_i - 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_t) - \sigma_1(a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_t)| \leqslant 2.$$

After we have made all necessary unit variations we come to the minimal continuant $\langle 1,1,a_1^*,a_2^*,...,a_t^*\rangle$ where all elements but one are from the set $\{1,n\}$. This exceptional element (if exists) must be greater than 1 and less than n. Hence

$$0\leqslant \sigma_1(a_1^*,a_2^*,...,a_t^*)\leqslant n/2.$$

Now we see that the number U of unit variations (used to get from the initial continuant the minimal one) is not less than the number U' of unit variations for which the sum $\sigma_1(a_1,...,a_t)$ strictly decreases. So

$$U\geqslant U'\geqslant \frac{\sigma_1(a_1,...,a_t)-n/2}{2}.$$

Each unit variation enlarges the continuant by the factor $\left(1+\frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right)$ as it was shown in Lemma 3. The statement (39) follows.

Now we prove the statement 2. Note that

$$|\min(|z-4|,|z-5|)-\min(|z-4-1|,|z-5-1|)|\leqslant 1.$$

When a pair of elements a_i,a_j is replaced by the pair a_i+1,a_j-1 we have

$$|\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_i+1,...,a_j-1,...,a_t)-\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_i,...,a_j,...,a_t)|\leqslant 2.$$

For the maximal continuant $\langle 1,1,a_1^{**},a_2^{**},...,a_t^{**}\rangle$ we have obviously

$$\sigma_2(a_1^{**},a_2^{**},...,a_t^{**})=0.$$

So the number of the unit variations used in the process of getting the maximal continuant is not less than $\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t)/2$.

Note that we know that the maximal continuant contains of digits $4,5$ only. So given sequence $a_1,...,a_t$ from $U(t,s)$ we may assume that some of digits a_j are $\leqslant 4$ meanwhile some of digits a_j are $\geqslant 5$. Moreover to obtain the sequence with the maximal value of the continuant from the sequence $a_1,...,a_t$ we may use the unit variation procedures with replacing digits $(a,b)\mapsto(a+1,b-1)$, $a+1\leqslant b-1$, $a\leqslant 4<5\leqslant b$ only. Now (41) follows from Lemma 4.

Lemma 6 is proved.

9. Inequalities with continuants: substitutions. Put $a_0=2$. In this section we consider three sequences $A=a_0,a_1,...,a_w$; $B=b_1,...,b_r$ and $C=c_1,c_2,...,c_k$. Define

$$K=\langle A,C,B\rangle,\ \ \alpha=\alpha(A,B,C)=(c_1-c_k)([\overleftarrow{A}]-[\overrightarrow{B}]),\ \ \Psi=\Psi(A,B,C)=\langle A,\overleftarrow{C},B\rangle. \tag{43}$$

We suppose n to be the maximal element among the elements of the sequences A,B,C.

Lemma 7. *Let $\alpha=\alpha(A,B,C)\neq 0$. Let $w,r\geqslant 1$ and $a_w\neq b_1$ or $r\geqslant 2$, $a_{w-1}\neq b_2$. Then*

$$1+\frac{1}{4(n+2)^8}\leqslant\left(\frac{\Psi}{K}\right)^{\mathrm{sign}(\alpha)}\leqslant 2.$$

Remark. Obviously Lemma 7 remains true in the case when B is an empty sequence and A,C are nonempty as formally $[B]=0$.

Proof. It follows from (29) and $\langle\overleftarrow{X}\rangle=\langle\overrightarrow{X}\rangle$ that

$$K=\langle A\rangle\langle C\rangle\langle B\rangle+\langle A^-\rangle\langle C_-\rangle\langle B\rangle+\langle A\rangle\langle C^-\rangle\langle B_-\rangle+\langle A^-\rangle\langle C_-^-\rangle\langle B_-\rangle$$

and

$$\Psi(A,B,C)=\langle A\rangle\langle C\rangle\langle B\rangle+\langle A^-\rangle\langle C^-\rangle\langle B\rangle+\langle A\rangle\langle C_-\rangle\langle B_-\rangle+\langle A^-\rangle\langle C_-^-\rangle\langle B_-\rangle$$

that

$$K - \Psi = \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle([\overrightarrow{C}] - [\overleftarrow{C}])([\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]). \tag{44}$$

As $\alpha(A,B,C) \neq 0$ we see that $\mathrm{sign}(c_1 - c_k) = -\mathrm{sign}([\overrightarrow{C}] - [\overleftarrow{C}])$. So

$$\mathrm{sign}(\Psi - K) = +\mathrm{sign}(\alpha(A,B,C)).$$

We should take into account inequalities

$$\frac{K}{4} \leqslant \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle \leqslant K \tag{45}$$

$$\frac{\Psi}{4} \leqslant \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle \leqslant \Psi \tag{46}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{(n+2)^3} \leqslant |[\overrightarrow{C}] - [\overleftarrow{C}]| \leqslant 1, \ \ \frac{1}{(n+2)^5} \leqslant |[\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]| \leqslant 1. \tag{47}$$

The upper bounds here are obvious. We give our comments to the lower bound from (47). As $c_1 \neq c_k$ we have

$$|[\overrightarrow{C}] - [\overleftarrow{C}]| \geqslant \min_{1 \leqslant c \leqslant n}\left(\frac{1}{c+1} - \frac{1}{c+1+1/(n+1)}\right) = \frac{1}{(n+1)^2(n+1+1/(n+1))} \geqslant \frac{1}{(n+2)^3}.$$

If $a_w \neq b_1$ by the similar reasons we have

$$|[\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]| \geqslant \frac{1}{(n+2)^3}.$$

If $a_w = b_1$ but $a_{w-1} \neq b_2$ we see that

$$|[\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]| \geqslant \min_{1 \leqslant a_w, a_{w-1} \leqslant n}\left(\frac{1}{a_w + 1/(a_{w-1} + 1/(n+1))} - \frac{1}{a_w + 1/a_{w-1}}\right) > \frac{1}{(n+2)^5}$$

and (47) follows.

If $\mathrm{sign}(\alpha) = +1$ we deduce from (44) the following inequality:

$$1 < \frac{\Psi}{K} = 1 - \frac{\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle([\overrightarrow{C}] - [\overleftarrow{C}])([\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}])}{K}.$$

Now from the last formula and (45,47) we have

$$1 + \frac{1}{4(n+2)^8} < \frac{\Psi}{K} \leqslant 2$$

and Lemma 7 is proved in this case.

If $\mathrm{sign}(\alpha) = -1$ from (44) we have the following inequality:

$$1 < \frac{K}{\Psi} = 1 + \frac{\langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle\langle C\rangle([\overrightarrow{C}] - [\overleftarrow{C}])([\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}])}{\Psi(A,B,C)}.$$

Now from the last formula and (46,47) we have

$$1 + \frac{1}{4(n+2)^8} < \frac{K}{\Psi} \leqslant 2$$

and Lemma 7 is proved.

Remark. Lemma 7 is close to the inequalities considered in [7],[8]. Equalities similar to (44) were considered in [10].

We consider a sequence $D = d_1, ..., d_t$ of the length t. Suppose that $h_1 < h_2 < ... < h_f = n = \max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant t} d_i$ are all *different* elements of the sequence D. Define

$$r_\nu = r_\nu(D) = \#\{i: \ d_i = \nu\} \geqslant 0, \ \ \nu = 1, 2, ..., n.$$

Of course $r_\nu \geqslant 1$ iff $\nu = h_j$ for some j. Let

$$\pi = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & t \\ \pi(1) & \pi(2) & \cdots & \pi(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

be a substitution.

The following lemma was announced in [9] without a proof. Here we give a complete proof. More general setting was considered in [7].

Lemma 8. *For a given D the following equality is valid for the maximum over all substitutions:*

$$\max_\pi \langle 1, 1, d_{\pi(1)}, d_{\pi(2)}, \ldots, d_{\pi(t)} \rangle = \langle 1, 1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{r_1}, \underbrace{2, ..., 2}_{r_2}, \ldots, \underbrace{n, ..., n}_{r_n} \rangle.$$

Proof. Consider any sequence $a_1, ..., a_t$ of natural numbers such that $a_i > a_j$ with some $i < j$. Let a_{i^*}, a_{j^*} be two elements of this sequence such that $a_{i^*} > a_{j^*}$ with maximal value of the difference $j^* - i^*$. Then

$$a_{i^*-1} \leqslant a_{j^*} < a_{i^*} \leqslant a_{j^*+1}. \tag{48}$$

(Of course it may happen that $i^* = 1$ or $j^* = t$. Then $a_{i^*-1} = 1$ or the sequence B below is an empty sequence.) Put

$$K = \langle 2, a_1, ..., a_t \rangle = \langle A, C, B \rangle,$$

where

$$A = 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_{i^*-1}; \quad B = a_{j^*+1}, ..., a_t; \quad C = a_{i^*}, ..., a_{j^*}.$$

From (48) it follows that for $\alpha(A, B, C)$ defined in (43) we have

$$\alpha(A, B, C) = (a_{i^*} - a_{j^*})([\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]) > 0.$$

Now from Lemma 7 we see that

$$\langle A, \overleftarrow{C}, B \rangle = \Psi(A, B, C) > K = \langle A, C, B \rangle.$$

But the sequence $A, \overleftarrow{C}, B$ may be obtained from the sequence $a_1, ..., a_t$ by a certain substitution. So for any sequence $a_1, ..., a_t$ with an inversion $a_i > a_j, i < j$ we can find a permutation π which enlarges the continuant $\langle a_1, ..., a_t \rangle$. Lemma 8 is proved.

We need a supplement to Lemma 8 in the case when the sequence D consists of elements $4, 5$ only.

Lemma 9. *Let D consists of elements $4, 5$ only. Then*

$$\langle 1, 1, d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_t \rangle \leqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 7^8}\right)^{-\rho/2} \langle 1, 1, \underbrace{4, ..., 4}_{r_4}, \underbrace{5, ..., 5}_{r_5} \rangle$$

where

$$\rho = \rho_t = \rho(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_t) = \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} |d_j - d_{j+1}| - 1. \tag{49}$$

Proof. By means of the substitutions from the proof of Lemma 8 one can construct from the initial continuant $\langle 1, 1, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_t\rangle$ the maximal one. After a substitution from the process initiated by the proof of Lemma 7 the sum

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} |d_j - d_{j+1}| \tag{50}$$

decreases by 2. For the maximal continuant the sum (50) is not greater than 1. So the number of the substitutions applied is not less than $\rho/2$. Each substitution enlarges the continuant by the factor $\left(1 + \frac{1}{4\cdot 7^8}\right)$ as it was shown in Lemma 7. Lemma is proved.

Lemma 10. *Let for the sequence D under consideration we have $h_1 = 1$ and $r_1 \geqslant t/2$. Then the following equality is valid for the minimum over all substitutions:*

$$\min_{\pi}\langle 1, 1, d_{\pi(1)}, d_{\pi(2)}, \dots, d_{\pi(t)}\rangle =$$

$$= \langle \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{2+r_1-r_2-...-r_n}, \underbrace{2, 1, 2, 1, ..., 2, 1}_{2r_2 \textit{ elements}}, \underbrace{3, 1, 3, 1, ..., 3, 1}_{2r_3 \textit{ elements}}, \dots, \underbrace{n, 1, n, 1, ..., n, 1}_{2r_n \textit{ elements}}\rangle.$$

Proof. First of all we prove that if a substitution $a_1, ..., a_t$ of the sequence D give the minimal value of the continuant $\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle$ then among every two consecutive elements a_i, a_{i+1} at least one element is equal to 1.

Suppose it is not so and we have two consecutive elements $a_{i^*}, a_{i^*+1} > 1$. As $r_1 > t/2$ we observe that there exists a pair of consecutive elements $a_l, a_{l+1} = 1, 1$. So

$$1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t = 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_{l-1}, 1, 1, a_{l+2}, ..., a_{i^*}, a_{i^*+1}, a_{i^*+2}, ..., a_t$$

or

$$1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t = 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_{i^*}, a_{i^*+1}, a_{i^*+2}, ..., a_{l-1}, 1, 1, a_{l+2}, ..., , a_t.$$

We consider only the first opportunity as the second one is similar. Put

$$A = 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_{l-1}, 1; \quad B = a_{i^*+1}, a_{i^*+2}, ..., a_t; \quad C = 1, a_{l+2}, ..., a_{i^*}.$$

For $\alpha(A, B, C)$ defined in (43) we have

$$\alpha(A, B, C) = (1 - a_{i^*})([\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]) < 0.$$

Hence

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle = \langle A, C, B\rangle > \Psi(A, B, C).$$

So the permutation $a_1, ..., a_t$ does not give the minimal value of the considered continuant. We came to the conclusion that the minimal continuant must be of the form

$$\langle 1, 1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{u}, a_1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_1}, a_2, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_2}, ..., a_{w-2}, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_{w-2}}, a_{w-1}, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_{w-1}}, a_w, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_w}\rangle, \ \ a_j \geqslant 2, \ j = 1, 2, ..., w, \tag{51}$$

where $w = r_2 + ... + r_f$, $v_1 + ... + v_w + u = r_1$, and $v_j \geqslant 1, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant w - 1$.

Now we shall show that $v_j = 1$ for all $j \in \{1, ..., w\}$.

First of all we shall show that $v_j \leqslant 1$ for all j. Indeed if $v_j \geqslant 2$ for some j we put

$$A = 1, 1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{u}; \quad B = 1, a_{j+1}, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_{j+1}}, ..., a_w, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_w}; \quad C = a_1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_1}, a_2, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_2}, ..., a_j, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{v_j - 1}$$

Then

$$\alpha(A, B, C) = (a_1 - 1)([\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]) < 0$$

and by Lemma 7 we have

$$\langle A, C, B\rangle > \Psi(A, B, C).$$

So $\langle A, C, B\rangle$ is not minimal.

We show that $v_w \neq 0$. This statement is obvious in the case $w = 1$. Suppose $w \geqslant 2$. Then if $v_w = 0$ put

$$A = 1, 1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{u}, a_1; \quad C = 1, a_2, 1, ..., a_{w-2}, 1, a_{w-1}, 1, a_w$$

and B define to be the empty sequence. Now

$$\alpha(A, B, C) = (1 - a_w)[\overleftarrow{A}] < 0$$

and again by Lemma 7 we se that $\langle A, C, B\rangle$ is not minimal.

We have proven that the minimal continuant is of the form

$$\langle 1, 1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{r_1 - r_2 - ... - r_n}, a_1, 1, a_2, 1, ..., a_{w-2}, 1, a_{w-1}, 1, a_w, 1\rangle, \;\; a_j \geqslant 2, \; j = 1, 2, ..., w, \;\; w = r_2 + ... + r_n. \quad (52)$$

To finish the proof of Lemma 10 we must show that in the minimal continuant $a_i \leqslant a_j$ for $i \leqslant j$. Suppose that for some $i \leqslant j$ one has $a_i > a_j$. Let a_{i^*}, a_{j^*} be two elements of this sequence such that $a_{i^*} > a_{j^*}$ with maximal value of the difference $j^* - i^*$. Then as in the proof of Lemma 8 we have

$$a_{i^*-1} \leqslant a_{j^*} < a_{i^*} \leqslant a_{j^*+1}.$$

We take

$$A = 1, 1, a_1, 1, ..., a_{i^*-1}, 1; \quad B = 1, a_{j^*+1}, 1, ..., a_t; \;\; C = a_{i^*}, 1, a_{i^*+2} 1, ..., a_{j^*}.$$

Then

$$\alpha(A, B, C) = (a_{i^*} - a_{j^*})([\overleftarrow{A}] - [\overrightarrow{B}]) < 0$$

as $[\overleftarrow{A}] < [\overrightarrow{B}]$. Again from Lemma 7 we see that $\langle A, C, B\rangle$ is not minimal. So we have proven that $a_i \leqslant a_j$ for all $i \leqslant j$. Lemma 10 follows.

We also need a supplement to Lemma 10 in the case when the sequence $d_1, ..., d_t$ consists of elements $1, n$ only. First of all given a sequence of partial quotients $d_1, d_2, ..., d_t$ we apply certain consecutive substitutions to obtain a sequence $d_1^*, d_2^*, ..., d_t^*$ such that for any i either d_i^* or d_{i+1}^* is equal to 1. We may take a certain type of this procedure to ensure that the sequence $d_1^*, d_2^*, ..., d_t^*$ depends on the initial sequence $d_1, d_2, ..., d_t$ only.

Lemma 11. *Suppose that the conditions of Lemma 10 are satisfied. Moreover suppose that the sequence* $d_1, ..., d_t$ *consists of elements* $1, n$ *only. Then we have*

$$\langle 1, 1, d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_t\rangle \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{4(n+2)^8}\right)^{\omega} \min_{\pi} \langle 1, 1, d_{\pi(1)}, d_{\pi(2)}, \ldots, d_{\pi(t)}\rangle.$$

where

$$\omega=\omega(d_1,d_2,...,d_t)=\sum_{j\leqslant t-1:\ d_j\geqslant 2}\delta(d_j,d_{j+1})+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{t-2}(1-\delta(d_j^*,d_{j+2}^*))-1,\quad \delta(a,b)=\begin{cases}1, & a=b,\\ 0, & a\neq b.\end{cases}\tag{53}$$

Proof. We see from the proof of Lemma 10 that we can obtain the minimal continuant from a given continuant in the following manner. First of all we apply substitutions to ensure that among two successive elements one element is equal to 1. For each permutation of such a kind the sum

$$\sum_{j\leqslant t-1:\ d_j\geqslant 2}\delta(d_j,d_{j+1})\tag{54}$$

decreases by 1 (remind that all $d_j\geqslant 2$ are equal to n). After several substitutions we come to a continuant of the form (51) and the sum (54) will be equal to zero. So we have used exactly $\sum_{j\leqslant t-1:\ d_j\geqslant 2}\delta(d_j,d_{j+1})$ substitutions on this stage. The sequence $d_1,...,d_t$ is transformed now into the sequence $d_1^*,...,d_t^*$.

Then we use substitutions to pass from a continuant of the form (51) to a continuant of the form (52). During this process the sum (54) does not change and remains equal lo zero. As for the sum

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t-2}(1-\delta(d_j^*,d_{j+2}^*))\tag{55}$$

we have the following observation. After each permutation this sum now decreases by 2. For the minimal continuant the sum (55) is less or equal to 1 (there is not more than one nonzero summand corresponding to the first element which is not equal to 1). So we have used $\omega=\omega(d_1,d_2,...,d_t)$ permutations to pass from the initial continuant to the minimal one. Each permutation adds at least a factor $\left(1+\frac{1}{4(n+2)^8}\right)$ by Lemma 7.

Lemma is proved.

10. Some estimates. Consider for irrational x the continued fraction expansion $x=[a_1,a_2,...,a_t,...]$. For any naturals k,t we define

$$w_k(t)=\#\{j\leqslant t:\ \ a_j\geqslant k\},\quad r_k(t)=w_k(t)-w_{k+1}(t)=\#\{j\leqslant t:\ \ a_j=k\}.\tag{56}$$

Lemma 12. *Suppose that for some t for an irrational number $x=[a_1,a_2,...a_t,...]$ we have $2r_1(t)\geqslant t$. Then for $n=n(t)=\max_{j\leqslant t}a_j$ one has*

$$\langle 2,a_1,...,a_t\rangle\geqslant\frac{\lambda_1^t}{10}\prod_{k=2}^{n}\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{r_k(t)}.\tag{57}$$

where λ_1 and μ_k are defined in (1), (2) respectively.

As $\lambda_1^2=\mu_1$ and $w_{n+1}(t)=0$ we see that

$$\prod_{k=2}^{n}\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{r_k(t)}=\prod_{k=2}^{n}\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\mu_{k-1}}\right)^{w_k(t)}.$$

Obviously $\mu_{k+1}>\mu_k$. So we immediately obtain

Corollary 3. *Under conditions of Lemma 12 one has for any natural $N\leqslant n$ the following inequality*

$$\langle 2,a_1,...,a_t\rangle\geqslant\frac{\lambda_1^t}{10}\prod_{k=2}^{N}\left(\frac{\mu_k}{\mu_{k-1}}\right)^{w_k(t)}.$$

Proof of Lemma 12. By Lemma 10 we see that

$$\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle \geqslant \langle \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{1+t-2(r_2+...+r_n)}, \underbrace{1, 2, ..., 1, 2}_{2r_2 \text{ elements}}, ..., \underbrace{1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2r_n \text{ elements}}\rangle$$

with $r_j = r_j(t) \geqslant 0$. Now we apply the formula $\langle A, B\rangle = \langle A\rangle\langle B\rangle(1 + [\overleftarrow{A}][\overrightarrow{B}])$. Note that in the case

$$[\overleftarrow{A}] = [h_k, 1, ...], \;\; [\overrightarrow{B}] = [1, h_{k+1}, ...]$$

one has

$$[\overleftarrow{A}] \geqslant \frac{1}{h_k + 1} \geqslant \frac{1}{h_{k+1}}, \;\; [\overrightarrow{B}] \geqslant \frac{1}{1 + 1/h_{k+1}} = \frac{h_{k+1}}{h_{k+1} + 1}, \;\; 1 + [\overleftarrow{A}][\overrightarrow{B}] \geqslant \frac{h_{k+1} + 2}{h_{k+1} + 1}.$$

So

$$\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle \geqslant \prod_{k=1}^{f-1} \frac{h_{k+1} + 2}{h_{k+1} + 1} \times \langle \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{1+t-2(r_2+...+r_n)} \rangle \langle \underbrace{1, 2, ..., 1, 2}_{2r_2 \text{ elements}}\rangle \cdots \langle \underbrace{1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2r_{h_k} \text{ elements}}\rangle =$$

$$\prod_{k=1}^{f-1} \frac{h_{k+1} + 2}{h_{k+1} + 1} \times \langle \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{1+t-2(r_2+...+r_n)} \rangle \times \prod_{k=2}^{f-1} \langle \underbrace{1, h_k, ..., 1, h_k}_{2r_k \text{ elements}}\rangle. \qquad (58)$$

One can easily see that

$$\langle \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{l}\rangle \geqslant \lambda_1^{l-1}. \qquad (59)$$

Also one can see from the continued fraction arguments that

$$\langle \underbrace{j, 1, ..., j, 1}_{2r \text{ elements}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\mu_j^{-1} - \mu_j}\left((1 - \mu_j)\mu_j^r + (\mu_j^{-1} - 1)\mu_j^{-r}\right) \geqslant \frac{j + \sqrt{j^2 + 4j}}{2\sqrt{j^2 + 4j}} \cdot \mu_j^r \geqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{j}\right) \cdot \mu_j^r \qquad (60)$$

where μ_j is defined in (2). Moreover

$$\prod_{k=1}^{f-1} \frac{h_{k+1} + 2}{h_{k+1} + 1} \times \prod_{k=1}^{f-1} \frac{h_{k+1} - 1}{h_{k+1}} \geqslant \prod_{k=2}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2}{k^2}\right) \geqslant \frac{1}{10}.$$

Now (57) follows from (58,59,60). Lemma 12 is proved.

For an irrational number $x = [a_1, a_2, ..., a_t, ...]$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, ..$ define values t_j inductively:

$$t_0 = 0, \;\; t_j = \min\{t > t_{j-1} : \; a_t \geqslant 2\}.$$

So $a_t \neq 1$ if and only if $t = t_j$ for some $j \geqslant 1$. In other words all partial quotients between a_{t_j} and $a_{t_{j+1}}$ are equal to one. Consider

$$D_t = \max_{u \leqslant t}(S_x(u) - \kappa_1 u).$$

Lemma 13. *Suppose $?'(x) = 0$. Then for any m large enough we have*

$$t_{m+1} - t_m \leqslant \frac{D_{t_m}}{\kappa_1 - 1} + 1, \qquad (61)$$

and for any function $\psi(t)$ *under conditions*

$$\psi(t) \geqslant 0, \quad \psi(t) = o\left(\frac{\log\log t}{\log t}\right), \quad \psi(t)\cdot\log t \to +\infty, \quad t\to\infty \tag{62}$$

one has

$$D_{t_m+1} \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{2\log\lambda_1 - \log 2}}{\log 2}\cdot\sqrt{t_m\log t_m}\cdot(1 - t_m^{-\psi(t_m)}). \tag{63}$$

Proof. Note that $q_t(x) \geqslant \lambda_1^{t-1}$ for every t. First of all as $?'(x) = 0$ we deduce from (13) that there exists $t_0(x)$ such that for each $t \geqslant t_0$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1^3} \geqslant \frac{\left|?\left(\frac{p_{t-1}}{q_{t-1}}\right) - ?\left(\frac{p_t}{q_t}\right)\right|}{\left|\frac{p_{t-1}}{q_{t-1}} - \frac{p_t}{q_t}\right|} = \frac{q_tq_{t-1}}{2^{S_x(t)}} \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^{2t-3}}{2^{S_x(t)}}.$$

As $2^{\kappa_1} = \lambda_1^2$ we see that

$$S_x(t) - \kappa_1 t \geqslant 0 \tag{64}$$

for t large enough. Particulary this inequality means that there exist infinitely many partial quotients a_j greater than 1.

Put $c_{m+1} = t_{m+1} - t_m - 1$. From (13) we have (by the same reasons) that the following inequality is valid for $m \geqslant m_0(x)$ (with some $m_0(x)$ depending on x and large enough):

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1^5} \geqslant \frac{q_{t_{m+1}-2}(x)q_{t_{m+1}-1}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{m+1}-1)}} \geqslant \frac{1}{\lambda_1^5}\cdot\frac{\lambda_1^{2t_{m+1}}}{2^{\kappa_1 t_m + D_{t_m} + c_{m+1}}} = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^5}\cdot\left(\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2}\right)^{c_{m+1}}\cdot\frac{1}{2^{D_{t_m}}}.$$

Now

$$c_{m+1} \leqslant \frac{D_{t_m}\log 2}{\log(\lambda_1^2/2)} = \frac{D_{t_m}}{\kappa_1 - 1}$$

and (61) follows.

By our notation the sequence $a_1, a_2, ..., a_{t_m}$ is of the form

$$a_1, a_2, ..., a_{t_m} = \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_1}, a_{t_1}, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_2}, a_{t_2}, ..., \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_m}, a_{t_m}, \quad a_{t_j} \geqslant 2.$$

Now by (64) and by the definition of D_t we have

$$a_{t_m} = S_x(t_m) - S_x(t_m - 1) = S_x(t_m) - \kappa_1 t_m - (S_x(t_m-1) - \kappa_1(t_m-1)) + \kappa_1 \leqslant D_{t_m} + \kappa_1 \tag{65}$$

for $m \geqslant m_0(x)$.

As $\kappa_1 \leqslant 3/2$ we deduce that for t large enough we may suppose that $r_1(t) > t/2$. So we can apply Lemma 12. Remind that $q_t \geqslant \frac{1}{8}\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle$. With (13) a for m large enough it gives

$$\frac{1}{80^2\lambda_1^2} \geqslant \frac{q_{t_m}^2}{2^{S_x(t_m+1)}} \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^{2t_m}\prod_{j=1}^m\left(\mu_{a_{t_j}}/\lambda_1^2\right)^2}{80^2 2^{S_x(t_m+1)}} \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^{2t_m}\prod_{j=1}^m\left(\mu_{a_{t_j}}/\lambda_1^2\right)^2}{80^2 2^{\kappa_1 t_m + D_{t_m+1} + \kappa_1}} = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^m\left(\mu_{a_{t_j}}/\lambda_1^2\right)^2}{80^2 2^{D_{t_m+1}+\kappa_1}}.$$

So as $\lambda_1^2 = 2^{\kappa_1}$ we have

$$\sum_{1\leqslant j\leqslant m}\log(\mu_{a_{n_j}}/\lambda_1^2) \leqslant \frac{\log 2}{2}\cdot D_{t_m+1}. \tag{66}$$

As $a_{t_j} \geqslant 2$ we see that $\log(\mu_{a_{t_j}}/\lambda_1^2) \geqslant \log(\mu_2/\lambda_1^2) > 1/3$. So

$$m \leqslant \frac{3\log 2}{2} \cdot D_{t_m+1}.$$

Now we take integer H to be large enough. From the definition (2) of μ_k we see that $\mu_k \geqslant k$. So for $a_{t_j} \geqslant H$ for large H we have

$$\log(\mu_{a_{t_j}}/\lambda_1^2) = \log a_{t_j} - 2\log\lambda_1 + \frac{\theta_H}{H}, \quad |\theta_H| \leqslant 5.$$

So (66) leads to

$$\sum_{1\leqslant j\leqslant m,\ a_{t_j}>H} \log a_{t_j} \leqslant \frac{\log 2}{2} \cdot D_{t_m+1} + 2m_1\log\lambda_1 + \frac{\theta_H m_1}{H} \tag{67}$$

where

$$m_1 = \#\{j \in \{1, ..., m\} : \ \ a_{t_j} \geqslant H\}.$$

Remind that

$$\sum_{j\leqslant m}(a_{t_j} - \kappa_1) - (\kappa_1 - 1)\sum_{j\leqslant m} c_j = S_x(t_m) - \kappa_1 t_m \geqslant 0$$

by (64). So

$$t_m = \sum_{j\leqslant m} c_j + m \leqslant \frac{1}{\kappa_1 - 1}\sum_{j\leqslant m}(a_{t_j} - \kappa_1) + m \leqslant \frac{1}{\kappa_1 - 1}\sum_{j\leqslant m} a_{t_j}.$$

Then from the definition of m_1 we have

$$t_m \leqslant \frac{1}{\kappa_1 - 1}\sum_{j\leqslant m} a_{t_j} \leqslant \frac{1}{\kappa_1 - 1}\left(mH + m_1 \max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant m} a_{t_j}\right). \tag{68}$$

So for large H from (67) we have

$$m_1 \log H \leqslant \frac{\log 2}{2} \cdot D_{t_m+1} + 2m_1\log\lambda_1 + \frac{\theta_H m_1}{H}.$$

From the last inequality we see that for H large enough the following estimate is valid:

$$m_1 \leqslant \frac{\log 2}{2} \cdot \frac{D_{t_m+1}}{\log H} + \frac{10D_{t_m+1}}{(\log H)^2}.$$

From (65) and (68) we deduce that for large H we have

$$t_m \leqslant \frac{1}{\kappa_1 - 1}\left(\frac{3\log 2}{2} D_{t_m+1} H + m_1 \max\left(\max_{j\leqslant m_0(x)} a_{t_j}\ ;\ \kappa_1 + D_{t_m+1}\right)\right).$$

So $D_t \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$ and

$$t_m \leqslant \frac{\log 2}{2(\kappa_1 - 1)} \cdot \frac{D_{t_m+1}^2}{\log H} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{3H\log H}{D_{t_m+1}} + \frac{20}{\log H} + \frac{20}{\log D_{t_m+1}}\right).$$

Inequality (63) follows from the last inequality by taking

$$H = D_{t_m+1}^{1-\psi(t_m)}/\log D_{t_m+1}$$

(here we take into account conditions (62)). Lemma is proved.

We introduce some more notation. For $r \in \{2,5,6,7,8,9,...\}$ put

$$\varphi_r(t) = \varphi_{r,x}(t) = \kappa_r t - S_x(t). \tag{69}$$

Lemma 14. *1. Let for an irrational $x \in (0,1)$ for infinitely many values of t one has*

$$4.1t < S_x(t) < 4.9t. \tag{70}$$

Then for these values of t the following inequality is valid:

$$\langle 1,1,a_1,...,a_t\rangle = o\left(\left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_2(t)}{\kappa_2}} 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}}\right), \quad t\to\infty. \tag{71}$$

2. Let for some t one has

$$4t \leqslant S_x(t) \leqslant 5t. \tag{72}$$

Then

$$\langle 1,1,a_1,...,a_t\rangle \leqslant \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_2(t)}{\kappa_2}} 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}+3}. \tag{73}$$

Note that $\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4} > 1$.

Proof of Lemma 14.

Let the inequality (72) is valid. We shall use the second statement of Lemma 5. Put $s = S_x(t)$. It follows that the maximal value of the continuant under consideration attains when its elements are of the form a and $a+1$. Obviously in our situation $a=4, a+1=5$. So

$$\langle 1,1,a_1,...,a_t\rangle \leqslant \langle 1,1,d_1,...,d_t\rangle, \quad d_j\in\{4,5\}, \ \ d_1+...+d_t = a_1+...+a_t.$$

This inequality is not enough for our purpose. We should make use of the second statement of Lemma 6. It gives

$$\langle 1,1,a_1,...,a_t\rangle \leqslant \left(\frac{385}{384}\right)^{-\sigma_{2,t}/2} \langle 1,1,d_1,...,d_t\rangle$$

with

$$\sigma_{2,t} = \sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t) = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \min\{|a_j-4|, |a_j-5|\}.$$

Applying Lemma 9 we get

$$\langle 1,1,a_1,...,a_t\rangle \leqslant \left(1+\frac{1}{4\cdot 7^8}\right)^{-\sigma_{2,t}/2-\rho_t/2} \langle 1,1,\underbrace{4,...,4}_{5t-S_x(t)},\underbrace{5,...,5}_{S_x(t)-4t}\rangle \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant 8\cdot\left(1+\frac{1}{4\cdot 7^8}\right)^{-\sigma_{2,t}/2-\rho_t/2} \langle\underbrace{4,...,4}_{5t-S_x(t)}\rangle\langle\underbrace{5,...,5}_{S_x(t)-4t}\rangle$$

with

$$\rho_t = \rho(d_1,...,d_t) = \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} |d_j - d_{j+1}| - 2.$$

Observe that

$$\underbrace{\langle h, ..., h\rangle}_{j} \leqslant \lambda_h^j.$$

Now

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle \leqslant 8 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 7^8}\right)^{-\sigma_{2,t}/2-\rho_t/2} \lambda_4^{5t-S_x(t)} \lambda_5^{S_x(t)-4t}.$$

From the notation (69) we see that

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_5}{\lambda_4}\right)^{S_x(t)} \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{t} = \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_2(t)}{\kappa_2}} 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}}.$$

So

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle \leqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 7^8}\right)^{-\sigma_{2,t}/2-\rho_t/2} \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_2(t)}{\kappa_2}} 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}+3}. \tag{74}$$

As $\sigma_{2,t}, \rho_t \geqslant 0$ the inequality (73) is proved.

If $\max\{\sigma_{2,t}, \rho_t\} \to \infty$ when $t \to \infty$ we have (71).

Let now the inequality (70) is valid.

Suppose that with some M for infinitely many values of t we have $\max\{\sigma_{2,t}, \rho_t\} \leqslant M$. Then for such t the number of digits $a_j \neq 4, 5$ from the sequence $a_1, ..., a_t$ is bounded by some constant M_1 depending only on M. Moreover either the number of $a_j = 4$ or the number of $a_j = 5$ is bounded by a constant M_2 depending only on M. It means that the continued fraction expansion for x is of the form $x = [b_1, ..., b_r, \overline{4}]$ or $x = [b_1, ..., b_r, \overline{5}]$. So $\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} = 4$ or 5. It is impossible under the condition (70).

Lemma 14 is proved.

Remark 1 to Lemma 14. Here we should note that the proof of Lemma 14 relays on the algorithm for obtaining the sequence with the maximal continuant from the sequence $1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t$. This algorithm consists of two stages. The first one uses unit variations only. It transforms the sequence $1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t$ into the sequence $1, 1, d_1, ..., d_t$. (The second stage uses substitutions only.) We may take a certain type of this procedure to ensure that the sequence $1, 1, d_1, ..., d_t$ depends on the initial sequence $1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t$ only. Moreover we take each unit variation from the first stage to transform a sequence $1, 1, ..., a, ..., b, ...$ (or $1, 1, ..., b, ..., a, ...$) into the sequence $1, 1, ..., a+1, ..., b-1, ...$ (or $1, 1, ..., b-1, ..., a+1, ...$) where a, b satisfies the conditions of Lemma 4. Hence in each unit variation we have $\sigma_2(..., a+1, ..., b-1, ...) \leqslant \sigma_2(..., a, ..., b, ...) - 1$ (or $\sigma_2(..., b-1, ..., a+1, ...) \leqslant \sigma_2(..., b, ..., a, ...) - 1$). Now the algorithm of transforming the sequence $1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t$ into the sequence $1, 1, d_1, ..., d_t$ uses not more than $\sigma_2(a_1, ..., a_t)$ unit variations.

Remark 2 to Lemma 14. In fact in Lemma 14 we have proven that

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle \leqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 7^8}\right)^{-\frac{\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t)}{2}-\frac{\rho(d_1,...,d_t)}{2}} \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_2(t)}{\kappa_2}} 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}+3}, \tag{75}$$

where the sequence $d_1, ..., d_t$ is obtained from the sequence $a_1, ..., a_t$.

Now we must investigate the procedure of obtaining the minimal continuant from the continuant $\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle$. First of all we use unit variations to transform the sequence $1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t$ into the sequence $1, 1, d_1, ..., d_t$ such that $d_i \in \{1, n\}$ (as in Lemma 5, part 1 and lemma 6, part 1). We take a certain type of such a procedure to ensure that the sequence $d_1, ..., d_t$ depends on the sequence $a_1, ..., a_t$ only. Then we apply substitutions from Lemma 11.

Lemma 15. *Let* $x = [a_1, ..., a_t, ...] \in E_n, n \geqslant 4$. *Let*

$$2S_x(t) \leqslant (n+1)t. \tag{76}$$

Then the following statements are valid.

1. If $n \geqslant 5$

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t \rangle \geqslant C_n \times \left(1 + \frac{1}{4(n+2)^8}\right)^{g_x(t)} \times \left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_n(t)}{(n-1)\kappa_n}} \times 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}}$$

where

$$g_x(t) = \frac{\sigma_1(a_1, ..., a_t)}{2} + \omega(d_1, ..., d_t) \tag{77}$$

and $\sigma_1(a_1, ..., a_t)$, $\omega(d_1, ..., d_t)$ *are defined in (40), (53) respectively and*

$$C_n = C_n' \times \left(1 + \frac{1}{4(n+2)^8}\right)^{-\frac{n}{4}} \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^2}{24\mu_n}, \qquad C_n' = \frac{1}{10}\left(\frac{\mu_n}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{\frac{2-n}{n-1}} \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^2}{10\mu_n}. \tag{78}$$

2. If $n = 4$ *then*

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t \rangle \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^2}{10}\mu_4^{S_x(t)/5-1}. \tag{79}$$

Proof.

First of all we apply Lemma 5 (statement 1). Put $s = S_x(t)$. Then we can suppose that not more than one element $z = d_j$ differs from $1, n$, while values $t, S_x(t)$ do not change. When we replace element z by 1 the continuant $\langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., z, ..., d_t \rangle$ may decrease:

$$\langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., z, ..., d_t \rangle \geqslant \langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., 1, ..., d_t \rangle.$$

So we can suppose that *all* d_j are from the set $1, n$ and the value t does not change while $S_x(t)$ should be replaced by $S' = S_x(t) - z + 1 \geqslant S_x(t) - n + 2$. Then for the values $w_j(t)$ we have

$$w_2(t) = w_3(t) = ... = w_n(t) = \frac{S' - t}{n-1}.$$

Now we apply Corollary 3 of Lemma 12 (remember that $\mu_1 = \lambda_1^2$ and that μ_j are increasing in j, so $\mu_n/\lambda_1^2 \geqslant 1$) and see that

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t \rangle \geqslant \frac{1}{10}\left(\frac{\mu_n}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{\frac{S'}{n-1}} \left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{\frac{t}{n-1}} \geqslant \left(\frac{1}{10}\left(\frac{\mu_n}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{\frac{2-n}{n-1}}\right) \left(\frac{\mu_n}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{\frac{S_x(t)}{n-1}} \left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{\frac{t}{n-1}}. \tag{80}$$

For $n = 4$ we put (76) into (80) and get (79).

Consider the case $n \geqslant 5$. By (69) we have

$$\left(\frac{\mu_n}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{\frac{S_x(t)}{n-1}} \left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{\frac{t}{n-1}} = \left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_n(t)}{(n-1)\kappa_n}} 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}}.$$

We have proven the estimate

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t \rangle \geqslant C_n' \left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_n(t)}{(n-1)\kappa_n}} 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}}.$$

Now we must explain the arrival of an additional factor

$$\left(1+\frac{1}{4(n+2)^8}\right)^{\frac{2\sigma_1-n}{4}+\omega(d_1,...,d_t)}. \qquad (81)$$

This factor appears from Lemmas 6 (part 1) and 11 as we can obtain the minimal continuant from a given one applyind at first unit variation procedures (and these procedures lead to first additional factor from Lemma 6) and at second substitutions procedures (another additional factor arrives from Lemma 11). The factor (81) takes into account the infuence of the both two factors described behind.

Lemma is proved.

11. Proofs of theorems.

11.1. Proof of Theorem 1 statement (i). Let $x = [a_1, ..., a_t, ...]$. Note that $q_t(x) \geqslant 2^{-3}\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle$. By Lemma 1 it is sufficient to prove that under the conditions of the statement (i) of Theorem 1 one has

$$W_t(x) := \frac{\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_{t-1}\rangle}{2^{S_x(t)}} \to +\infty, \quad t \to \infty.$$

Consider values $w_2(t)$ defined in (56). Note that $w_2(t + 1) \geqslant w_2(t)$ for any t. We distinguish two cases

Case 1. $\kappa = \limsup_{t\to+\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} < \kappa_1$.

Case 2. $\limsup_{t\to+\infty} \frac{S_x(t)}{t} = \kappa_1$.

In the case 1 by Corollary 3 with $N = 1$ and the condition (6) of Theorem 1 we see that

$$W_t(x) \geqslant \frac{1}{100\lambda_1 \cdot 2^C} \times \left(\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2^\kappa}\right)^t \to +\infty, \quad t \to +\infty$$

(as $\lambda_1^2 = 2^{\kappa_1} > 2^\kappa$).

In the case 2 we see that $w_2(t) \to +\infty$ as $t \to +\infty$. Also we should take into account that under the conditions of Theorem 1 (i) one has for t large enough

$$r_1(t) > \frac{t}{2}, \quad \sum_{i:1\leqslant i\leqslant t,\ a_i\geqslant 2} a_i = S_x(t) - t + w_2.$$

Remind that the number of partial quotients greater than 1 is $w_2 = r_2 + ... + r_n$ (here $r_j \geqslant 0$ and n is the maximal partial quotient). Remind also that $\mu_2 < \mu_3 < ... < \mu_n$ and $\mu_j > j$. Consider the value

$$\mu = \min \mu_2^{r_2} \cdots \mu_n^{r_n}$$

where the minimum is taken over the set

$$\left\{ r_2, ..., r_{n-1} \geqslant 0, r_n \geqslant 1 : \sum_{j=2}^n r_j = w_2, \ \sum_{j=2}^n jr_j = S_x(t) - t + w_2 \right\}.$$

We see that

$$\mu \geqslant \mu_2^{w_2-1}\mu_n \geqslant \mu_2^{w_2-1}n \geqslant \mu_2^{w_2-1} \times \frac{\sum_{i:1\leqslant i\leqslant t,\ a_i\geqslant 2} a_i}{w_2} \geqslant \mu_2^{w_2-1} \times \frac{S_x(t) - t + w_2}{w_2}.$$

Application of Lemma 12 gives

$$\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_t \rangle \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^t}{10} \prod_{k=2}^{n} \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\lambda_1^2} \right)^{r_k(t)} \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^{t-2}}{10} \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_1^2} \right)^{w_2 - 1} \frac{S_t(x) - t}{w_2}$$

and of course

$$\langle 2, a_1, ..., a_{t-1} \rangle \geqslant \lambda_1^t.$$

So

$$W_t(x) \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1^{2t} \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_1^2} \right)^{w_2 - 1} (S_t(x) - t)}{10 \lambda_1^2 w_2 \cdot t \cdot 2^{\kappa_1 t + C}} \gg \frac{1}{w_2} \cdot \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_1^2} \right)^{w_2} \to +\infty, \quad t \to \infty$$

as $w_2 \to +\infty$. Statement (i) of Theorem 1 is proved.

11.2. Proof of Theorem 1 statement (ii). We shall prove that for any function $\psi(t)$ increasing to infinity there exists an irrational number $x \in (0,1)$ such that $?'(x)$ does not exist and

$$S_x(t) \leqslant \kappa_1 t + \frac{\log t}{\log 2} + \psi(t).$$

We may suppose that $\psi(1) \geqslant 1$ and that $\psi(t) = 0(t), t \to \infty$. We define integers $c_j, Q_j\, j = -1, 0, 1, 2, ...$ and $t_j, b_j,\ j = 0, 1, 2, ...$ by the following inductive procedure. Put $c_{-1} = 0, Q_{-1} = 1, t_0 = b_0 = 0$. Now suppose that integers $c_j, q_j\ j = -1, 0, 1, 2, ..., k-1$ and $t_j, b_j, j\ j = 0, 1, 2, ..., k$ are defined. We must construct integers $c_k, Q_k, t_{k+1}, b_{k+1}$. First of all take c_k to be large enough to satisfy inequalities

$$\kappa_1 c_k > \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j + \sum_{j=0}^{k} b_j + 2\kappa_1, \tag{82}$$

$$Q_{k-1}^2 < 2^{\frac{\psi(t_k + c_k + 1)}{2}}, \tag{83}$$

$$c_k \geqslant \left[\kappa_1 (t_k + c_k + 1) + \frac{\log(t_k + c_k + 1)}{\log 2} + \psi(t_k + c + k + 1) \right] - \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j - \sum_{j=0}^{k} b_j. \tag{84}$$

It is possible to do this as in the right hand side of (82) the coefficient for c_k is equal 1 meanwhile in the left hand side the corresponding coefficient is equal to $\kappa_1 > 1$; as at the same time Q_{k-1} from (83) does not depend on c_k. Moreover as c_k increases the the right hand side of (84) depends on c_k approximately as $(\kappa_1 - 1)c_k$.

Then put

$$t_{k+1} = t_k + c_k + 1, \ \ b_{k+1} = \left[\kappa_1 t_{k+1} + \frac{\log t_{k+1}}{\log 2} + \psi(t_{k+1}) \right] - \sum_{j=1}^{k} c_j - \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_j.$$

From (82) we see that $b_{k+1} \geqslant 2$. Now we define

$$Q_k = \langle \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_0}, b_1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_1}, b_2, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_2}, b_3, ..., \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_{k-1}}, b_k, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_k}, b_{k+1} \rangle.$$

This continuant consist of t_{k+1} partial quotients. Note that

$$Q_{k-1} \lambda_1^{c_k - 1} b_{k+1} \leqslant Q_k \leqslant 4 Q_{k-1} \lambda_1^{c_k} b_{k+1}. \tag{85}$$

Now we take irrational x of the form

$$x=[a_1,...,a_t,...]=[\underbrace{1,...,1}_{c_0},b_1,\underbrace{1,...,1}_{c_1},b_2,\underbrace{1,...,1}_{c_2},b_3,...,\underbrace{1,...,1}_{c_{k-1}},b_k,\underbrace{1,...,1}_{c_k},b_{k+1},...].$$

Now

$$Q_k=q_{t_{k+1}}(x),\ \ k=1,2,3,....$$

We see that for $t_k\leqslant t<t_{k+1}$

$$S_x(t)=\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}c_j+\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}b_j+b_k+t-t_k\leqslant 1+\kappa_1t_k+\frac{\log t_k}{\log 2}+\psi(t_k)+t-t_k\leqslant\kappa_1t+\frac{\log t}{\log 2}+\psi(t).$$

So for x constructed the inequality (7) from the statement (ii) of Theorem 1 is true. At the same time from (13) and (84) and the upper bound from (85) we see that

$$\frac{\left|?\left(\frac{p_{t_{k+1}-1}}{q_{t_{k+1}-1}}\right)-?\left(\frac{p_{t_{k+1}}}{q_{t_{k+1}}}\right)\right|}{\left|\frac{p_{t_{k+1}-1}}{q_{t_{k+1}-1}}-\frac{p_{t_{k+1}}}{q_{t_{k+1}}}\right|}=\frac{q_{t_{k+1}}q_{t_{k+1}-1}}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t_{k+1}}}}\leqslant\frac{16Q_{k-1}^2\lambda_1^{2c_k}b_{k+1}}{2^{\sum_{j=0}^{k}c_j+\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}b_j}}\leqslant\frac{32Q_{k-1}^2\lambda_1^{2c_k}b_{k+1}}{2^{\kappa_1t_{k+1}+\frac{\log t_{k+1}}{\log 2}+\psi(t_{k+1})}}\leqslant 2^{-\frac{\psi(t_{k+1})}{2}}\to 0$$

as $k\to\infty$. From the other hand from (13) we deduce by means of (82) and the lower bound from (85) the following inequality:

$$\frac{\left|?\left(\frac{p_{t_k-2}}{q_{t_k-2}}\right)-?\left(\frac{p_{t_k-1}}{q_{t_k-1}}\right)\right|}{\left|\frac{p_{t_k-2}}{q_{t_k-2}}-\frac{p_{t_k-1}}{q_{t_k-1}}\right|}=\frac{q_{t_k-1}q_{t_k-2}}{2^{a_1+...+a_{t_k-1}}}\geqslant$$

$$\geqslant\frac{(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}b_j)\times\lambda_1^{2\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}c_j-2k}}{2^{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}c_j+\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}b_j}}\geqslant\frac{(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}b_j)\times\lambda_1^{2\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}c_j-2(k-1)}}{2^{\kappa_1c_{k-1}}}\geqslant\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}b_j\to\infty,\ \ k\to\infty.$$

So $?'(x)$ does not exist.

Statement (ii) of Theorem 1 is proved.

11.3. Proof of Theorem 2 statement (i). Let $t_m<t\leqslant t_{m+1}$. Suppose m to be large enough. We see from (63) of Lemma 13 that

$$D_t\geqslant D_{t_m+1}\geqslant\frac{\sqrt{2\log\lambda_1-\log 2}}{\log 2}\cdot\sqrt{t_m\log t_m}\cdot(1-t_m^{-\psi(t_m)}).\qquad(86)$$

We apply (61) of Lemma 13 to see that

$$t_m\geqslant t-\frac{D_{t_m}}{\kappa_1-1}-1\geqslant t-\frac{D_t}{\kappa_1-1}-1.\qquad(87)$$

We substitute (87) into (86) and obtain the result of the statement (i) from Theorem 2.

11.4. Proof of Theorem 2 statement (ii). Put

$$b_k=\left[\frac{2k\log(k+3)}{\log 2}\right],\ \ k=1,2,3,...$$

and define

$$c_0=2,\ \ c_k=\max\left(1;\left[\frac{b_k-2\log(2^4b_k)/\log 2}{\kappa_1-1}\right]\right),$$

$$t_k = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j + k.$$

Then as $\lambda_1^2/2 = 2^{\kappa_1 - 1}$ we have for all k large enough ($k \geqslant k_0(x)$)

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2}\right)^{c_k} \leqslant \frac{2^{b_k}}{2^8 b_k^2}. \tag{88}$$

We take x of the form

$$x = [a_1, ..., a_t, ...] = [\underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_0}, b_1, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_1}, b_2, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_2}, b_3, ..., \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_{k-1}}, b_k, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_k}, b_{k+1}, ...].$$

Now as $\lambda_1^2/2 > 1$ for any $c \leqslant c_k$ (with $k \geqslant k_0(x)$) we see that

$$\frac{q_{t_k - c}^2}{2^{S_x(t_k - c)}} \leqslant \frac{2^6 q_{t_{k-1}}^2 \lambda_1^{2(c_k - c)} b_k^2}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1}) + c_k + b_k - c}} \leqslant \frac{2^6 q_{t_{k-1}}^2 b_k^2}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1})}} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2}\right)^{c_k}$$

and by (88) we have

$$\frac{q_{t_k - c}^2}{2^{S_x(t_k - c)}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{q_{t_{k-1}}^2}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1})}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2^k} \cdot \frac{q_{t_{k_0}}^2}{2^{S_x(t_{k_0})}} \to 0, \quad k \to \infty.$$

So

$$\frac{q_r^2}{2^{a_1 + ... + a_r}} \to 0, \quad r \to \infty$$

and we apply Lemma 2 to see that $?'(x) = 0$.

Now we must prove an upper bound for $S_x(t)$. By the definition of c_j we have the following lower bound for the values of t_k:

$$t_k = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j + k = \sum_{j=0}^{k_0 - 1} c_j + \sum_{j=k_0}^{k} c_j + k \geqslant \frac{k^2 \log k}{(\kappa_1 - 1)\log 2}\left(1 - \frac{32}{k}\right).$$

So

$$k \leqslant \sqrt{2(\kappa_1 - 1)\log 2} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{t_k}{\log t_k}} + 64, \quad c_{k+1} \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{2}{(\kappa_1 - 1)\log 2}} \cdot \sqrt{t_k \log t_k} + 2^7 \log t_k.$$

From the definition of c_j we deduce that

$$c_j \geqslant \frac{1}{\kappa_1 - 1}\left(b_j - \frac{\log(16 b_j)}{\log\sqrt{2}} - 1\right)$$

or

$$b_j \leqslant (\kappa_1 - 1)c_j + \frac{2}{\log 2}\log j + 4\log\log(j+3).$$

Now we combine all the estimates behind and deduce an upper bound for D_t from the range $t_k < t \leqslant t_{k+1}$:

$$S_x(t) - \kappa_1 t = S_x(t_{k+1} - (t_{k+1} - t)) - \kappa_1(t_{k+1} - (t_{k+1} - t)) = S_x(t_{k+1}) - \kappa_1 t_{k+1} + (t_{k+1} - t)(\kappa_1 - 1) \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant S_x(t_{k+1}) - \kappa_1 t_{k+1} + (\kappa_1 - 1)c_{k+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j + \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_j - \kappa_1\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j + k\right) + (\kappa_1 - 1)c_{k+1} =$$

$$= (1-\kappa_1)\sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j + \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_j - \kappa_1 k + (\kappa_1 - 1)c_{k+1} \leqslant (\kappa_1 - 1)c_{k+1} + \frac{2k\log k}{\log 2} + 8k\log\log k \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant 2\sqrt{\frac{2(\kappa_1-1)}{\log 2}}\cdot\sqrt{t_k\log t_k} + 2^6\sqrt{\frac{t_k}{\log t_k}}\log\log t_k \leqslant 2\sqrt{\frac{2(\kappa_1-1)}{\log 2}}\cdot\sqrt{t\log t} + 2^6\sqrt{\frac{t}{\log t}}\log\log t.$$

Statement (ii) of Theorem 2 is proved.

11.5. Proof of Theorem 3 statement (i). By Lemma 2 it is sufficient to prove that we have

$$q_t^2(x) = o(2^{S_x(t)}), \quad t\to\infty. \tag{89}$$

Case 1. $S_x(t) < 4.9t$.

Remind that $\kappa_2 > 4.1$.

From (8) it follows that $\varphi_2(t) \leqslant C$. So the first statement of Lemma 14 leads to the bound (89).

Case 2. $4.9t \leqslant S_x(t) \leqslant 5t$.

Here $\varphi_2(t) \leqslant -0.4t$. So the second statement of lemma 14 leads to the result of Theorem 3.

Case 3. $S_x(t) > 5t$.

Take $t > 100$. Consider a sequence

$$a_1, ..., a_{j-1}, a_j, a_{j+1}, ..., a_t \tag{90}$$

with the sum

$$a_1 + ... + a_j + ... + a_t = S_x(t).$$

We may replace this sequence by the sequence

$$a_1, ..., a_{j-1}, 1, a_j - 1, a_{j+1}, ..., a_t.$$

Then the sum of the digits does not change but the length of the sequence increases by 1. Applying this replacement several times instead of the sequence (90) we obtain a sequence

$$b_1, ..., b_{t'}$$

with the same sum of digits

$$S'(t') = S_x(t)$$

such that

$$S'(t') \leqslant 5t'.$$

As $t > 100$ we see that $S'(t') \geqslant 4.9t'$.

Note that

$$\langle a_1, ..., a_{j-1}, a_j, a_{j+1}, ..., a_t\rangle \leqslant \langle a_1, ..., a_{j-1}, 1, a_j - 1, a_{j+1}, ..., a_t\rangle.$$

So

$$\langle a_1, ..., a_t\rangle \leqslant \langle b_1, ..., b_{t'}\rangle.$$

Now we derive an upper bound for the continuant $\langle 1, 1, b_1, ..., b_{t'}\rangle$ from the second statement of Lemma 14. Now (89) follows analogously to the case 2.

Statement (i) of Theorem 3 is proved.

11.6. Proof of Theorem 3 statement (ii). We must construct a number x such that $?'(x)$ does not exist but (9) holds for all t. Put

$$x = [\underbrace{5, ..., 5}_{c_1}, \underbrace{4, ..., 4}_{b_1}, \underbrace{5, ..., 5}_{c_2}, \underbrace{4, ..., 4}_{b_2}, ..., \underbrace{5, ..., 5}_{c_k}, \underbrace{4, ..., 4}_{b_k}, ...], \tag{91}$$

$$t_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k}(c_j + b_j) \tag{92}$$

where c_k, b_k are defined by the following inductive procedure.

Let $t_0 = c_0 = b_0 = 0$. Now suppose that $c_0, b_0, ..., c_{k-1}, b_{k-1}$ are defined. For a natural c_k we define

$$b_k = b(c_k) = \left[\frac{(5-\kappa_2)c_k + \psi(t_{k-1}+c_k) - \psi(t_{k-1})}{\kappa_2 - 4}\right],$$

$$Q(t_k) = \langle \underbrace{5,...,5}_{c_1}, \underbrace{4,...,4}_{b_1}, \underbrace{5,...,5}_{c_2}, \underbrace{4,...,4}_{b_2}, ..., \underbrace{5,...,5}_{c_{k-1}}, \underbrace{4,...,4}_{b_{k-1}}, \underbrace{5,...,5}_{c_k}, \underbrace{4,...,4}_{b(c_k)} \rangle,$$

$$S(t_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}(5c_j + 4b_j) + 5c_k + 4b(c_k).$$

We take c_k to be large enough to satisfy the condition

$$\frac{Q(t_k)^2}{2^{S(t_k)}} \geqslant 1. \tag{93}$$

It is possible to do as from the definition (4) of κ_2 we have

$$\frac{\lambda_5^{2(\kappa_2-4)}\lambda_4^{2(5-\kappa_2)}}{2^{\kappa_2}} = 1$$

and so

$$\frac{Q(t_k)^2}{2^{S(t_k)}} \gg \frac{\lambda_5^{2c_k}\lambda_4^{2b(c_k)}}{2^{5c_k+4b(c_k)}} \gg \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{\frac{2\psi(t_{k-1}+c_k)}{\kappa_2}} \to \infty, \;\; c_k \to \infty.$$

So given $c_0, b_0, ..., c_{k-1}, b_{k-1}$ we define $c_k, b_k = b(c_k)$. Real x is defined by its continued fraction expansion. So $q_{t_k}(x) = Q(t_k)$ and $S_x(t_k) = S(t_k)$.

As for any k we have (93) we see that the equality $?'(x) = 0$ is not possible. It is not difficult to see from the construction that in the case $\psi(t) = o(\sqrt{t})$ the derivative $?'(x)$ *does not* exist. (In fact it follows from Theorem 4.)

Consider t from the interval $t_{k-1} < t \leqslant t_k$. This interval can be divided into two intervals: $t_{k-1} < t \leqslant t_{k-1} + c_k$ (the first interval) and $t_{k-1} + c_k < t \leqslant t_k = t_{k-1} + c_k + b_k$ (the second interval). In the first interval as $5 > \kappa_2$ and $\psi(\cdot)$ increases we have

$$S_x(t) = S_x(t_{k-1}) + 5c \geqslant \kappa_2 t_{k-1} - \psi(t_{k-1}) + 5c \geqslant \kappa_2(t_{k-1}+c) - \psi(t_{k-1}+c)$$

(here $c = t - t_{k-1}$) and everything is fine. In the second interval for any $b \leqslant b_k$ we have

$$S_x(t_{k-1}+c_k+b) = S_x(t_{k-1}) + 5c_k + 4b \geqslant \kappa_2 t_{k-1} - \psi(t_{k-1}) + 5c_k + 4b =$$

$$= \kappa_2(t_{k-1}+c_k+b) - \psi(t_{k-1}) + (5-\kappa_2)c_k - (\kappa_2-4)b \geqslant \kappa_2(t_{k-1}+c_k+b) - \psi(t_{k-1}+c_k) \geqslant$$

$$\geqslant \kappa_2(t_{k-1}+c_k+b) - \psi(t_{k-1}+c_k+b).$$

Statement (ii) of Theorem 3 is proved.

11.7. Proof of Theorem 4 statement (i). As $?'(x) = +\infty$ we see by Lemma 2 that

$$\frac{q_t(x)}{2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}}} \to \infty, \;\; t \to \infty.$$

So by formula (75) from Remark 2 to Lemma 14

$$\varphi_2(t) \geqslant G(\sigma_2(a_1, ..., a_t) + \rho(d_1, ..., d_t)), \quad G = \frac{\kappa_2 \log(1 + (4 \cdot 7^8)^{-1})}{2(5 \log \lambda_4 - 4 \log \lambda_5)}$$

for t large enough (here we use the notation from the proof of Lemma 14, see also Remark 1 to Lemma 14).

If $\sigma_2(a_1, ..., a_t) + \rho(d_1, ..., d_t) \geqslant \sqrt{t}/10$ then $\varphi_2(t) \geqslant G\sqrt{t}/10$ and (10) follows.

If $\sigma_2(a_1, ..., a_t) + \rho(d_1, ..., d_t) < \sqrt{t}/10$ then $\rho(d_1, ..., d_t) < \sqrt{t}/10$. Consider the sequence $1, 1, d_1, ..., d_t$ from the proof of Lemma 14. We should note that $\kappa_2 > 4.4$ Hence the number of partial quotients among $d_1, ..., d_t$ which are equal to 5 is not less than $0.4t$. At the same time these partial quotients are distributed into not more than $\rho(d_1, ..., d_t) < \sqrt{t}/10$ blocks. So there exist $k \geqslant 0.4t/0.1\sqrt{t} = 4\sqrt{t}$ consecutive digits $d_{\nu+1}, ..., d_{\nu+k}$ equal to 5. So $\sigma_{2,t} < \sqrt{t}/10 < k/40$. We consider the sequence

$$1, 1, d_1, ..., d_\tau = 1, 1, d_1, ..., d_\nu, \underbrace{5, ..., 5}_{k}, \quad \tau = \nu + k \leqslant t.$$

Remind that under the conditions of Theorem 4 we have $?'(x) = +\infty$. From Lemma 2 for t large enough we deduce the following inequalities (here we take into account Remark to the Definition of the unit variation and Remark 1 to lemma 14):

$$2^8 \leqslant \frac{q_\tau^2(x)}{2^{S_x(\tau)}} \leqslant \frac{(2^{\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t)} \times \langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., d_\nu, \underbrace{5, ..., 5}_{k}\rangle)^2}{2^{S_x(\tau)}} \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant \frac{(2^{\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t)} \times \langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., d_\nu, \underbrace{5, ..., 5}_{k}\rangle)^2}{2^{d_1+...+d_\nu+5k-\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t)}} \leqslant 2^{3\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t)+2} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_5^2}{2^5}\right)^k \cdot \frac{\langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., d_\nu\rangle^2}{2^{d_1+...+d_\nu}}.$$

As $d_j \in \{4, 5\}$ we have $4\nu \leqslant d_1 + ... + d_\nu \leqslant 5\nu$. From the second part of Lemma 14 we have

$$\frac{\langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., d_\nu\rangle^2}{2^{d_1+...+d_\nu}} \leqslant 2^6 \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{2 \cdot \frac{\kappa_2\nu - d_1 - ... - d_\nu}{\kappa_2}}.$$

But

$$\kappa_2\nu - (d_1 + ... + d_\nu) = \varphi_{2,x}(\nu) + \theta\sigma_2(a_1, ..., a_t), \quad |\theta| \leqslant 1.$$

Now

$$2^8 \leqslant 2^{3\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t)+8} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_5^2}{2^5}\right)^k \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{2(\varphi_{2,x}(\nu)+\sigma_2(a_1,...,a_t))} \leqslant 2^{\frac{3k}{40}+8} \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_5^2}{2^5}\right)^k \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_4^5}{\lambda_5^4}\right)^{2\varphi_2(\nu)+\frac{2k}{40}}.$$

So

$$1 \leqslant \left(\frac{\lambda_5^{72}\lambda_4^{10}}{2^{197}}\right)^k \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_4^{400}}{\lambda_5^{320}}\right)^{\varphi_2(\nu)}$$

and $\varphi_2(\nu) \geqslant 0.0005k \geqslant 0.002\sqrt{t}$. So Statement (i) of Theorem 4 is proved.

11.8. Proof of Theorem 4 statement (ii). We shall construct x in the from (91), t_k should be defined as in (92). Of course the choise of parameters c_j, b_j will be different from that from the Theoerm 3 (statement (ii)). Put

$$c_1 = 100, \; b_k = 100 + 10k, \; c_{k+1} = \left[\frac{b_k(\log \lambda_4 - \log 4) - \log 60}{5 \log \sqrt{2} - \log \lambda_5}\right],$$

Then

$$c_{k+1} = \frac{b_k(\log\lambda_4 - \log 4)}{5\log\sqrt{2} - \log\lambda_5} - 70\theta = \frac{\kappa_2 - 4}{5 - \kappa_2} \times b_k - 70\theta, \ \ 0 \leqslant \theta < 1.$$

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_5^2}{2^5}\right)^{c_k - 1} \left(\frac{\lambda_4^2}{2^4}\right)^{b_{k-1}} > 2, \quad \frac{\lambda_5^2}{2^5} < 1 < \frac{\lambda_4^2}{2^4}.$$

Now

$$\frac{q^2_{t_{k-1}+c_k}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1}+c_k)}} \geqslant \frac{q^2_{t_{k-2}+c_{k-1}}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-2}+c_{k-1})}} \times \left(\frac{\lambda_5^2}{2^5}\right)^{c_k - 1} \left(\frac{\lambda_4^2}{2^4}\right)^{b_{k-1}} > 2\frac{q^2_{t_{k-2}+c_{k-1}}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-2}+c_{k-1})}} \gg 2^k \to +\infty$$

as $k \to \infty$. But for $c \leqslant c_k$ we have

$$\frac{q^2_{t_{k-1}+c}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1}+c)}} \geqslant \frac{q^2_{t_{k-1}+c_k}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1}+c_k)}}.$$

Also for any $b \geqslant 1$ we have

$$\frac{q^2_{t_{k-1}+c_k+b}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1}+c_k+b)}} \geqslant \frac{q^2_{t_{k-1}+c_k}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1}+c_k)}} \times \left(\frac{\lambda_4^2}{2^4}\right)^{b} \geqslant \frac{q^2_{t_{k-1}+c_k}(x)}{2^{S_x(t_{k-1}+c_k)}}.$$

So

$$\frac{q_t^2(x)}{2^{S_x(t)}} \to +\infty, \ \ t \to \infty$$

and $?'(x) = +\infty$.

Now we see that

$$\varphi_2(t_k) = \kappa_2 t_k - S_x(t_k) \leqslant \varphi_2(t_{k-1}) + (\kappa_2 - 4)b_k - (5 - \kappa_2)c_k =$$

$$= \varphi_2(t_{k-1}) + (\kappa_2 - 4)b_{k-1} - (5 - \kappa_2)c_k + (\kappa_2 - 4)(b_k - b_{k-1}) = \varphi_2(t_{k-1}) + 70(5 - \kappa_2\theta) + 10(\kappa_2 - 4) \quad (94)$$

(here $\varphi_2(\cdot)$ is defined in (69)).

So we obtain recursive inequality

$$\varphi_2(t_k) \leqslant \varphi_2(t_{k-1}) + 400$$

and $\varphi_2(t_k) \leqslant 400k$, while

$$t_k \geqslant \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_j \geqslant 5k^2.$$

From the other hand (94) leads to

$$\varphi_2(t_k) > \varphi_2(t_{k-1}).$$

Moreover in the example under consideration for any k the function $d \mapsto \varphi_2(t_{k-1} + d)$ decreases in the interval $0 \leqslant d \leqslant c_k$ and increases in the interval $c_k \leqslant d \leqslant c_k + b_k$. It follows from the equality

$$\varphi_2(t_{k-1} + d) = \varphi_2(t_{k-1}) - (5 - \kappa_2)d, \ \ 0 \leqslant d \leqslant c_k,$$

and from the equality

$$\varphi_2(t_{k-1} + d) = \varphi_2(t_{k-1} + c_k) + (\kappa_2 - 4)(d - c_k), \ \ c_k \leqslant d \leqslant c_k + b_k.$$

Hence in the interval $0 \leqslant d \leqslant c_k + b_k$ one has

$$\varphi_2(t_{k-1} + d) \leqslant \varphi_2(t_k).$$

Let $t_{k-1} \leqslant t < t_k$. then

$$\varphi_2(t) \leqslant \varphi_2(t_k) \leqslant 400k \leqslant 400\sqrt{t_k/5} \leqslant 400\sqrt{t/5} \cdot (t_k/t_{k-1}) \leqslant 200\sqrt{t}$$

for t large enough. Theorem 4 is proved.

11.9. Proof of Theorem 5 statement (i). Remind that $\kappa_n < \frac{n+1}{2}$ and from (11) we have $\varphi_n(t) = \kappa_n t - S_x(t) \geqslant -C$. Note that the functions $g_x(t)$ defined in (77) increases in t.

We consider two cases.

Case 1. $g_x(t) \to \infty,\ \ t \to \infty$;

Case 2. $g_x(t)$ is bounded as $t \to \infty$.

In the case 1 the result follows from Lemmas 1 and 15 (part 1).

In the case 2 irrational x has the following continued fraction expansion: $x = [a_1, ..., a_T, \overline{1}]$. So obviously $?'(x) = +\infty$. Statement (i) of Theorem 5 is proved.

11.10 Proof of Theorem 5 statement (ii). The proof is close the the proof of Theorem 3 statement (ii). It is necessary to construct a number x such that $?'(x)$ does not exist but (12) holds for all t. Define

$$x = [\underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_1}, \underbrace{1, n, 1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2b_1 \text{ digits}}, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_2}, \underbrace{1, n, 1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2b_2 \text{ digits}}, ..., \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_k}, \underbrace{1, n, 1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2b_k \text{ digits}}, ...], \qquad (95)$$

$$t_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (c_j + 2b_j). \qquad (96)$$

Here c_k, b_k we define inductively. Put $t_0 = c_0 = b_0 = 0$. Now suppose that $c_0, b_0, ..., c_{k-1}, b_{k-1}$ are defined. For a natural c_k we define

$$b_k = b(c_k) = \left[\frac{(\kappa_n - 1)c_k + \psi(t_{k-1} + c_k) - \psi(t_{k-1})}{n - 2\kappa_n + 1}\right].$$

Now

$$Q(t_k) = \langle\underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_1}, \underbrace{1, n, 1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2b_1 \text{ digits}}, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_2}, \underbrace{1, n, 1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2b_2 \text{ digits}}, ..., \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{c_k}, \underbrace{1, n, 1, n, ..., 1, n}_{2b_k \text{ digits}}\rangle,$$

$$S(t_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (c_j + (n+1)b_j).$$

Take c_k to be large enough to satisfy the condition

$$\frac{Q(t_k)^2}{2^{S(t_k)}} \leqslant 1.$$

It is possible to do as from the definition () of κ_n we have

$$\frac{\lambda_1^{2(n-2\kappa_n+1)} \mu_n^{\kappa_n - 1}}{2^{(n-1)\kappa_n}} = 1.$$

So one can easily see that in the case $\psi(t) = o(\sqrt{t})$ the derivative $?'(x)$ does not exist (by Theorem 6). To prove that for all t the inequality (12) is valid we need to perform the calculations similar to those from the proof of Theorem 3 statement (ii).

Statement (ii) of Theorem 5 is proved.

11.11. Proof of Theorem 6 statement (i).

We shall give a sketched proof only. The proof follows the steps of the proof of Theorem 4 statement (i) Suppose that all partial qoutients of x are bounded by n and $?'(x) = 0$. Analogously to the function $\sigma_1(a_1, ..., a_t)$ defined in Lemma 6 we must consider a little bit more difficult function $\sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t)$. The definition is as follows.

Given the sequence of partial qoutients $a_1, ..., a_t$ we enumerate all of them different from $1, n$ in the non-decreasing order:

$$1 < a_{i_1} \leqslant a_{i_2} \leqslant ... \leqslant a_{i_k} < n, \quad k \leqslant t$$

(so exactly $t-k$ partial quotients are equal to 1 or n). Put formally $a_{i_0} = 1, a_{i_{k+1}} = n$. Now to define $\sigma_1^{(n)} = \sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t)$ we put

$$\sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t) = \sum_{j=0}^{k}(n - 1 - (a_{i_{j+1}} - a_{i_j})).$$

We should note that $\sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t) \geqslant 0$ and in the case $k \geqslant 1$ we have $\sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t) > 0$. Then analogously to (39) Lemma 6 we deduce

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, a_2, ..., a_t\rangle \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{16(n+2)^3}\right)^{\frac{\sigma_1^{(n)} - n + 1}{2n-2}} \times \min_{(b_1, b_2, ..., b_t) \in U_n(t,s)} \langle 1, 1, b_1, b_2, ..., b_t\rangle. \qquad (97)$$

If $S_x(t) \geqslant \frac{n+1}{2}t$ then for such t theorem is proven by $\frac{n+1}{2} > \kappa_n + \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover, by the same reasons theorem is valid in the case when there exists ν such that $\sqrt{t} \leqslant \nu \leqslant t$ and $S_x(\nu) \geqslant \left(\frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{1}{10}\right)\nu$. It follows from the inequality

$$\max_{u \leqslant t}(S_x(u) - \kappa_n u) \geqslant S_x(\nu) - \kappa_n \nu \geqslant \left(\frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{1}{10} - \kappa_n\right)\nu \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{t}}{3}.$$

Hence we may assume that for all ν from the interval $\sqrt{t} \leqslant \nu \leqslant t$ we have

$$S_x(\nu) < \left(\frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{1}{10}\right)\nu, \quad \sqrt{t} \leqslant \nu. \qquad (98)$$

So the conditions of Lemmas 10, 11 are satisfied. As $S_x(t) \leqslant \frac{n+1}{2}t$ and $r_1(t) \geqslant \frac{t}{2}$ we may do the following. Analogously to Lemma 15 we apply (97) and Lemma 11 to get the inequality

$$\langle 1, 1, a_1, ..., a_t\rangle \geqslant C_n \times \left(1 + \frac{1}{4(n+2)^8}\right)^{g_x^{(n)}(t)} \times \left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{\frac{\varphi_n(t)}{(n-1)\kappa_n}} \times 2^{\frac{S_x(t)}{2}} \qquad (99)$$

with

$$g_x^{(n)}(t) = \frac{\sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t)}{2n-2} + \omega(d_1, ..., d_t).$$

Here C_n is the same as in the formula (78) from Lemma 15. The algorithm from the proof of Lemma 6 (part 1) is also modified: given a sequence $a_{i_1}, ..., a_{i_k}$ with the smallest element $a_{i_1} > 1$ and the largest element $a_{i_k} < n$ we replace them by $a_{i_1} - 1$ and $a_{i_k} + 1$ correspondingly and then enumerate all the elements of the new sequence (which are not equal to 1 or n) in non-decreasing order again. Moreover we remark here that at each step of the algorithm described the value of $\sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t)$ decreases at least by 4 but not more than $2n-2$. The sequence $d_1, ..., d_t$ is just the sequence appearing from $a_1, ..., a_t$ after all unit variations.

Now form Lemma 1 and (99) we have for t large enough

$$-\varphi_n(t) \geqslant \frac{g_x^{(n)}(t)}{16(n+2)^8}.$$

Put

$$M = \frac{1}{10(n+2)^2}. \tag{100}$$

Now we consider two cases.

If $g_x^{(n)}(t) \geqslant M\sqrt{t}$ then

$$\max_{u\leqslant t}(-\varphi_n(u)) \geqslant -\varphi_n(t) \geqslant \frac{M}{16(n+2)^8} \times \sqrt{t}$$

and theorem follows.

Consider the case $g_x^{(n)}(t) \leqslant M\sqrt{t}$.

The proof of the formula (99) uses three stages. The first step is the process of transformation of the initial sequence of partial qoutients $a_1, ..., a_t$ into the sequence $d_1, ..., d_t$ with elements 1 and n (with a possible exception of one element) by means of a certain sequence of unit variations. The second and the third stages are related to Lemma 11. The second stage uses permutations to transform the sequence $d_1, ..., d_t$ into the sequence in which there is no consecutive elements equal to n. The third stage collects together blocks of the form $1, 1, ..., 1$. In order to prove Theorem 6 we need to consider what happens after the first and the second stages of the process are completed.

From the definition of $g_x^{(n)}(t)$ as $\omega(d_1, ..., d_t) \geqslant -1$ we see that

$$\sigma_1^{(n)}(a_1, ..., a_t) \leqslant (g_x^{(n)}(t)+1)(2n-2) \leqslant 2C(n-1)\sqrt{t} + 2n.$$

So the first stage takes not more than $\sigma_1^{(n)}/4 = (M(n-1)\sqrt{t}+n)/2$ unit variations.

As

$$\sum_{j\leqslant t-1:\ d_j\geqslant 2} \delta(d_j, d_{j+1}) \leqslant g_x^{(n)}(t) + 1 \leqslant M\sqrt{t} + 1$$

we have done not more than $M\sqrt{t}+1$ permutations during the second step of the process.

So we see that for t large enough first two stages of the algorithm uses not more than $(M(n-1)\sqrt{t}+n)/2 + M\sqrt{t} + 1 \leqslant Mn\sqrt{t}$ unit variations and substitutions.

Moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t-2}(1-\delta(d_j^*, d_{j+2}^*)) \leqslant g_x^{(n)}(t) + 1 \leqslant M\sqrt{t} + 1.$$

So

$$\sum_{\sqrt{t}\leqslant j\leqslant t-2} (1-\delta(d_j^*, d_{j+2}^*)) \leqslant M\sqrt{t} + 1.$$

Put $\gamma = [\sqrt{t}] + 1$. We see that after the first and the second stages are completed the sequence of partial quotients $a_\gamma, a_{\gamma+1}, .., a_t$ consist of not more than $M\sqrt{t}+2$ consecutive blocks of the form $1, 1, ..., 1$ or $1, n, 1, n, ..., 1, n$. Note that there is not more than $\frac{M\sqrt{t}+2+1}{2} \leqslant M\sqrt{t}$ blocks $1, 1, ..., 1$ among them (for t large enough).

Remind that

$$\kappa_n \leqslant \kappa_5 < 2.5 < \frac{n+1}{2}.$$

So the total number of elements 1 in all blocks of the form $1,1,...,1$ from the interval $[1,t]$ is not less than $t/10$. Hence the number of elements 1 in blocks of the form $1,...,1$ from the interval $[\gamma,t]$ is not less than $t/10-\sqrt{t}$. These elements are located in not more than $M\sqrt{t}$ blocks. Hence there exist a block $1,1,...,1$ of the length

$$k \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{t}}{10M}-\frac{1}{M}. \tag{101}$$

Let now $d_1^*,...,d_t^*$ denotes the sequence of partial quotients which appears after the first and the second stages of the process. We consider the initial part of the sequence $d_1^*,...,d_t^*$ with k units at the end:

$$1,1,d_1^*,...,d_\tau^* \;=\; 1,1,d_1^*,...,d_\nu^*\underbrace{1,1,...,1}_{k}, \;\; \tau=\nu+k\leqslant t, \;\; \nu\geqslant\sqrt{t}.$$

Note that every elementary procedure of the first and the second stage of the process (unit variation or permutation) changes the continuant $\langle 1,1,a_1,...,a_\nu\rangle$ or $\langle 1,1,d_1,...,d_\nu\rangle$, not more than by the factor $2(n+1)^2$. Really, for unit variations it follows from Remark after Definition 1; for substitutions it follows from (29). To see this one can take a sequence of the form

$$C=n,1,n,1,...,n,1 \quad \text{or} \quad C=1,n,1,n,...,1,n$$

in the substitution $K\to\Psi(A,B,C)$ from Lemma 7. Note that this choice of the sequence C leads to the following result. Each unit variation or substitution during the first and the second stages changes the value $S_x(\nu)$ not more than by $n-1$. The total number of procedures does not exceed $Mn\sqrt{t}$. Hence $|S_x(\nu)-(d_1^*+...+d_\nu^*)|\leqslant Mn^2\sqrt{t}$. So $\kappa_n\nu-(d_1^*+...+d_\nu^*)=\varphi_{n,x}(\nu)+\theta\cdot Mn^2\sqrt{t},\ |\theta|\leqslant 1$. The conditions of Lemma 15 (part 1) are still valid for the number $x^*=[d_1^*,...,d_\nu^*,...]$ which appears from $x=[a_1,...,a_\nu,...]$ after the first and the second stages are completed. This fact follows from (98) and the inequality $Mn^2\leqslant 1/10$ as

$$d_1^*+...+d_\nu^* < \left(\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{1}{10}\right)\nu+Mn^2\sqrt{t}\leqslant\left(\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{1}{10}+Mn^2\right)\nu\leqslant\frac{n+1}{2}\nu.$$

As $?'(x)=0$ Lemma 1 and the above arguments lead to

$$\frac{1}{16\lambda_1^4\cdot(\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2})^{1/M}}\geqslant\frac{(q_{\tau-1})^2}{2^{S_x(\tau)}}\geqslant\frac{\langle 1,1,a_1,...,a_{\tau-1}\rangle^2}{2^{S_x(\tau)+6}}\geqslant\frac{\langle 1,1,d_1^*,...,d_\nu^*,\underbrace{1,1,...,1}_{k-1}\rangle^2}{(2(n+1)^2)^{Mn\sqrt{t}}\times 2^{6+d_1^*+...+d_\nu^*+k)+Mn^2\sqrt{t}}}\geqslant$$

$$\geqslant\frac{4}{2^6\lambda_1^4}\times\frac{1}{n^{4Mn\sqrt{t}}\cdot 2^{Mn^2\sqrt{t}}}\times\left(\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2}\right)^k\times\frac{\langle d_1^*,...,d_\nu^*\rangle^2}{2^{d_1^*+...+d_\nu^*}}.$$

We apply (101) and Lemma 15 (part 1) for the sequence $d_1^*,...,d_\nu^*$ and obtain the inequality

$$1\geqslant\frac{(\lambda_1^2/2)^{\frac{\sqrt{t}}{10M}}}{4^{Mn^2\sqrt{t}}}\times\left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{2^{\frac{\kappa_n\nu-(d_1^*+...+d_\nu^*)}{(n-1)\kappa_n}}}\geqslant\frac{(\lambda_1^2/2)^{\sqrt{t}/(10M)}}{4^{Mn^2\sqrt{t}}}\times\left(\frac{\lambda_1^{n+1}}{\mu_n}\right)^{2^{\frac{\varphi_{n,x}(\nu)-Mn^2\sqrt{t}}{(n-1)\kappa_n}}}.$$

The last inequality leads to

$$-\varphi_{n,x}(\nu)\geqslant\frac{\sqrt{t}}{(n+2)^3}.$$

Theorem 6 statement (i) is proved.

11.12. Proof of Theorem 6 statement (ii).

We shall construct x in the form (95). Values of t_k should be defined as in (96). Of course the choice of parameters c_j, b_j will be different of them from the Theorem 5 statement (ii).

Put

$$c_1 = 100, \;\; b_k = 100 + 10k, \;\; c_{k+1} = \left[\frac{b_k((n+1)\log 2 - 2\log \mu_n) - 10}{2\log \lambda_1 - \log 2} \right].$$

Then

$$c_{k+1} = \frac{b_k((n+1)\log 2 - 2\log \mu_n)}{2\log \lambda_1 - \log 2} - 70\theta \leqslant \frac{n - 2\kappa_n + 1}{\kappa_n - 1} b_k - 70\theta, \;\; 0 \leqslant \theta \leqslant 1.$$

So

$$4\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{c_k} \left(\frac{\mu_n}{\sqrt{2}^{n+1}}\right)^{b_{k-1}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}, \;\; \frac{\mu_n}{\sqrt{2}^{n+1}} < 1 < \frac{\lambda_1}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{102}$$

In the sequel the proof follows the steps of the proof of Theorem 4 statement (ii). Inequalities (102) lead to $\frac{q_t^2(x)}{2^{S_x(t)}} \to 0, t \to \infty$. So $?'(x) = 0$.

Moreover, for $\varphi_n(t)$ we have

$$-\varphi_n(t_k) = S_x(t_k) - \kappa_n(t_k) = -\varphi_n(t_{k-1}) + (n + 1 - 2\kappa_n)b_k - (\kappa_n - 1)c_k =$$

$$= -\varphi_n(t_{k-1}) + (n + 1 - 2\kappa_n)b_{k-1} - (\kappa_n - 1)c_k + (n + 1 - 2\kappa_n)(b_k - b_{k-1}) \leqslant -\varphi_n(t_{k-1}) + 30n.$$

So we have recursive inequality

$$-\varphi_n(t_k) \leqslant -\varphi_n(t_{k-1}) + 30n$$

and

$$-\varphi_n(t_k) \leqslant 30kn.$$

At the same time

$$t_k \geqslant \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_j \geqslant 5k^2.$$

The monotonicity of the function $d \mapsto -\varphi_n(t_{k-1} + d)$ in the interval $0 \leqslant d \leqslant c_k + 2b_k$ is proved by the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4 statement (ii). As a result we have

$$-\varphi_n(t_{k-1} + d) \leqslant -\varphi_n(t_k).$$

Hence for $t_{k-1} \leqslant t < t_k$ we have

$$-\varphi_n(t) \leqslant -\varphi_n(t_k) \leqslant 30kn \leqslant 30n\sqrt{t_k/5} \leqslant 30n\sqrt{t/5}\, t_k/t_{k-1} \leqslant 15n\sqrt{t}$$

for t large enough. Theorem 6 statement (ii) is proved.

11.13. Proof of Theorem 7.

It is sufficient to deduce a lower bound for the continued fraction denominator

$$q_t^2(x) \geqslant (2 + \varepsilon)^{S_x(t)} \tag{103}$$

for some positive ε. By Lemma 5 statement 1 we may assume that all partial quotients are equal 1 or 4. Applying Lemma 7 we see that

$$q_t(x) \geqslant \frac{1}{8} \cdot \langle 1, 1, d_1, ..., d_k, \underbrace{4, ..., 4}_{m}, b_1, ..., b_l \rangle$$

for certain $m = m(t), k = k(t), l = l(t)$ where sequences $d_1, ..., d_k$ and $b_1, ..., b_l$ consist of elements 1 and 4; moreover there is no two consecutive 4 in both of these sequences. Then

$$\langle \underbrace{4, ..., 4}_{m} \rangle \geqslant \lambda_4^{m-1}.$$

For continuants

$$\langle d_1, ..., d_k \rangle, \ \ \langle b_1, ..., b_l \rangle$$

the inequality (76) is true and we apply formula (80) from Lemma 15 (part 2). So

$$\langle d_1, ..., d_k \rangle \gg \mu_4^{\frac{d_1+...+d_k}{5}}, \ \ \langle b_1, ..., b_l \rangle \gg \mu_4^{\frac{b_1+...+b_l}{5}}.$$

Now

$$q_t(x) \gg \mu_4^{\frac{d_1+...+d_k+b_1+..+b_l}{5}} \lambda_4^m.$$

As $\mu_4^{1/5} > 1.42 > \sqrt{2}, \lambda_4 > 4.2$ we have (103) with $\varepsilon = 0.001$. Theorem 7 is proved.

References

[1] Minkowski H. Gesammelte Abhandlungen vol.2 (1911).

[2] Salem R. On some singular monotone functions which are strictly increasing. // Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 53 (1943), 427 - 439.

[3] Kinney J.R. Note on a singular function of Minkowski. // Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 11 (1960), p. 788 - 789.

[4] Paradis J., Viader P., Bibiloni L. A new light on Minkowski's $?(x)$ function. // J. Number Theory., 73 (1998), 212 -227.

[5] Paradis J., Viader P., Bibiloni L. The derivative of Minkowski's $?(x)$ function. // J. Math. Anal. and Appl. 253 (2001), 107 - 125.

[6] Anna A. Dushistova, Nikolai G. Moshchevitin, On the derivative of the Minkowski question mark function $?(x)$. // Preprint, available at arXiv: 0706.2219v2 [math.NT] 17Dec2007

[7] Graham R.L., Knuth D.E., Patashnik O. Concrete Mathematics. Addison-Wesley, 1994.

[8] Knuth D.E. Art of Computer Programming V.2., Third edition. Addison-Wesley, 1997.

[9] Kan I.D, Refinding of the comparison rule for continuants. // Discrete Math. Appl. 10 (2000), no. 5, 477 - 480.

[10] Motzkin T.S., Straus E.G. Some combinatorial extremum problems. // Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (1956), 7, 1014 - 1021.